MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D. C., January 10, 1952

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, during the fiscal year 1952, was held in its Office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, January 10, 1952. The following members were present:

Mr. Finley, Chairman,
Mr. Neild,
Prof. Hudnut,
Prof. Belluschi,
Mr. Peets,
Mr. deWeldon,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, held November 29, 1951, were approved.

2. PROPOSED GIFT OF CARILLON BELLS: Under date of January 3, 1952, President Truman sent to Chairman Finley the following Memorandum:

THE WHITE HOUSE
Washington
January 3, 1952.

Memorandum For: Honorable David E. Finley,
Chairman, Fine Arts Commission.

From: The President.

Attached is a memorandum from the Secretary of State regarding the gift from the people of the Netherlands, of forty bells to be hung in a tower in Washington.

I wish you would take a look at the situation and see what sort of suggestion can be made on it.

Harry S. Truman.

COPY RESTRICTED

Department of State,
Washington,
December 31, 1951

Memorandum for the President

Subject: Gift of a Carillon from the Netherlands

The Netherlands Ambassador has told us of a proposal for a gift of a carillon from the people of the Netherlands to the people of this country. The idea has the consent of Her Majesty Queen Juliana, and the Netherlands Cabinet has agreed to its execution. A committee for the project has been formed under the direction of Dr. Leonardus G. Kortenhorst, Chairman of the Dutch Lower Chamber of Parliament.

The carillon would be made in one of the old Dutch bell foundries and would be hung in a bell tower to be erected in a suitable location in Washington. The underlying idea is that the different bells, approximately 40 in number, would represent various sectors of the population of the Netherlands. One would be a present from Dutch youth, another would be a present from Dutch labor, and so on.

It is proposed that funds for the bells would be collected in the Netherlands primarily by means of many small contributions rather than by large donations. Dr. Kortenhorst is expected to launch the appeal for funds with a Nation-wide broadcast on New Year's Eve. According to press reports, Mr. E. Timmermans, Municipal carillonist of Rotterdam, plans to visit Washington early in 1952 to inspect accoustical and technical aspects of the site to be selected.

Although we understand that the entire carillon cannot be completed in less than a year, Her Majesty could present in April one small bell in token of the whole.

In our view, a bell tower, housing this gift from the Dutch people, could become a distinguished landmark in Washington, representative of the long tradition of friendship between the United States and the Netherlands.

We recommend that you authorize us to tell the Netherlands Ambassador you will be glad to accept on behalf of the American people this generous expression of friendship, and that the Department be authorized to consult with other responsible United States agencies regarding the details of the location and construction of the tower and to reach agreement on these details with appropriate Netherlands authorities.

(s) Dean Acheson

The Commission considered the matter in detail. It was felt that the gift should be accepted. However, attention was called to a few items that were not sufficiently clear to the Commission. In the first place, there was no indication that the people of The Netherlands would provide a Carillon Tower. This should be a high tower, and the expense of it would be costly, an estimated $1,000,000. To place the bells in the Washington Monument, the Post Office Tower on Pennsylvania

Avenue, the Dome of the Capitol, or the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, was not considered suitable. Therefore, a Carillon Tower would have to be built. Also, if located on public land in the District of Columbia an Act of Congress would be necessary. A reply was sent to President Truman, recommending acceptance of the proposed gift, and stating that the Commission would be glad to cooperate with the Secretary of State or other Government officials in working out arrangements for the Carillon. (Exhibit A).

3. GEORGE CARVER AND BOOKER T. WASHINGTON MEMORIAL COIN: The Secretary presented a letter received from Honorable Leland Howard, Acting Director of the Mint (Exhibit B) complaining of the procedure followed recently in approving models for the George Carver and Booker T. Washington Memorial Coin.

Mr. deWeldon stated that he approved the models subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Mint, and that there was no intention of violating any form of procedure of the Mint in such matters; that Mr. S. J. Phillips of the Memorial Committee presented the models to him, with the statement that it was necessary to expedite approval of them since the coin had to be minted by the end of the year 1951. It has since been learned that this is not true.

After discussion, the Commission decided to send a letter to Mr. Howard, advising that in the future the procedure he recommended, namely, that models for memorial coins be first approved by the Bureau of the Mint be followed. (Exhibit B-1. See also B-2).

4. BUST OF THE LATE BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM B. MITCHELL: Chairman Finley stated that Dr. Alexander Wetmore, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, has advised him that there has been willed to the Smithsonian Institution the sum of $15,000 for a statue of the late Brigadier General William B. Mitchell, for display in the proposed Air Museum that has been authorized by Congress. General Mitchell

was a great champion of aviation about twenty years ago. Dr. Wetmore desires that the Commission recommend a suitable sculptor to do a bust of General Mitchell.

Mr. deWeldon recommended, Walker Hancock, Herbert Haseltine, William Zorach, Paul Manship, in which the Commission concurred (Exhibit C).

5. DESIGN FOR "PORTAL TO GEORGETOWN:" The Secretary presented a set of working drawings received from the Building Inspector of the District of Columbia (Shipstead-Luce Act Submission No. 1465, dated December 28, 1951) for final approval. It is to be a Gasoline Service Station at Pennsylvania Avenue and M Streets, Northwest. The design of the building, which is Colonial in character, had heretofore been approved by the Committee of Consulting Architects on "Old Georgetown" and also by the Commission.

The Secretary stated that he brought the plans to the attention of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, but they had no comments to make.

Mr. Peets suggested that some study be given to the landscape treatment of the grounds. Accordingly, the submission was approved, provided a landscape plan and a planting plan be submitted by the owners in due time. The Building Inspector was notified accordingly.

6. DESIGN FOR PHARMACY BUILDING, HOWARD UNIVERSITY: Mr. Leonard L. Hunter, Acting Supervising Architect, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, submitted a design for a proposed Pharmacy Building to be built at Howard University. He called upon Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson, Architect of the University, to explain the drawing. Mr. Robinson said:

> "This is a building, gentlemen, that is a second sequence to the one that you approved in an earlier meeting, which occupies this adjacent site (indicating). The building that we are concerned with this morning is in that location, and it is to be a pharmacy building. It follows the general education building program of a predominently laboratory type with a minimum of any special purpose rooms other than that. There is a library and a lecture room, class rooms, and the rest supporting rooms.

"The general characteristics of the building, so far as site is concerned, were carefully thought of in relation to the other building and the revisions imposed by the necessity of having to get two buildings in total over-all site.

"The architectural considerations were based largely in deference to a consideration on the University's part to recall the spurt at least of the Georgian characteristic of the community of buildings in the lower campus. We are presenting a preliminary sketch of the new building."

Prof. Belluschi said it is rather unfortunate that there is a narrowness of space between the Pharmacy building and the adjoining one, which gave the appearance of an alley between two buildings and felt it might improve the situation if a garden wall was introduced to visually join the two buildings; Mr. Robinson said, 41 feet 4 inches. Another location was suggested, but Mr. Robinson said, "There is no other solution open to us."

Prof. Hudnut said, "Is it not true that the width is greater here than would be portrayed by that sketch?" Mr. Robinson replied, "Of course, that sketch is not faithful in terms of the plan. There is really a sixty foot alley for a forty foot building."

Prof. Belluschi was not satisfied with the design of the entrance. He recommended approval of the design, with the recommendation that the architect make a model so as to convince him about the entrance, and help him improve the design—there is the scale, and depth to be considered. To this Prof. Hudnut agreed.

Mr. Peets had some comments to make as to landscaping, and suggested consideration be given to a landscape plan for the building.

Accordingly, the design was approved, subject to the suggestions above stated (Exhibit D).

7. RESTORING GOVERNMENT PAINTINGS: The Commission was in conference with Honorable W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, on the subject of restoring paintings belong- to the Government (fully 1,000) that are located in the various Departments of the

Government, as also the White House, and the Capitol. The importance of the work proposed was recognized. Mr. Finley said,--

"I shall be glad to show you the quarters and equipment of our restorer in the National Gallery of Art. We have an excellent restorer and rooms equipped with everything that is needed. Most of the larger museums have such equipment. It is not appreciated, I think, by the average laymen how very important and difficult is the work of restoration of paintings. It is like submitting yourself to an operation. One wants to be very sure that the surgeon is competent. An incompetent restorer can easily ruin a painting by inexpert efforts at restoration.

"In the case of important paintings one must be sure to put them in the hands of restorers. Some of the best restorers command, of course, very high prices. I have had friends who brought paintings, especially family portraits, to the National Gallery and asked to have them restored, and when they found that relining the canvas and clean up the painting would cost from $300 to $500 they were horrified. They had expected that it could be done for $10 or $15.

"A restorer should not only be a highly qualified man but he usually needs one or two assistants. If the Government is to set up a restorer's studio, it will require some money."

Professor Hudnut remarked that the man who restored "Night Watch" received ten times as much as Rembrandt did for doing the work originally.

Mr. Reynolds said, "We have spent quite a little time discussing the project; we are setting it up in the Buildings Management Office, but the primary job is to get someone who is competent that we could have on a full-time basis and hire him within the regulations."

Mr. Finley said he was under the impression that there is no such a classification in the Civil Service for a restorer and that the restorer in the National Gallery was employed on a contract basis.

Mr. Reynolds was of the opinion that there is no such position under the Civil Service. He felt it might be better to handle the work on a contract basis. Mr. Finley agreed that it might be better to do that.

The Secretary reported that Mr. Harold F. Cross, of 1820 Jefferson Place, NW., Washington, D. C., has applied for a position of restorer of paintings, and that he made a general preliminary survey of paintings in Government buildings last summer and found there are fully one thousand, many of which are in urgent need of restoration, because of long neglect.

Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, thinks, because most of the paintings are in the possession of the Executive Departments of the Government, that Departments should arrange for this work.

Mr. Reynolds doubted the advisability of trying to get legislation through Congress for this work. "We could set up a proper organization that would be in a position to do all of the work outside of our own jurisdiction also, for which we would be reimbursed. Thus we could do work for the Capitol and the Library of Congress on a reimbursable basis, as also the Supreme Court.

Mr. Finley said,— "I think it is extremely important to set up such an organization under Mr. Reynolds' direction. The White House portraits were in a very bad condition. They have been largely restored, cleaned at least, and there is still a good deal of work that should be done on them. Those portraits are of the greatest historical importance. I feel we would be derelict in our duty if we did not provide proper care for them. So that if Mr. Reynolds is agreeable to it, we would like to recommend that you set up an office of a restorer of works of art belonging to the Government, other than those in museums."

Mr. Reynolds replied, "That is right. We are willing to do it. We have always, of course, the question of funds which have been highly restricted, you know, this last year. Apparently it is going to be even more so this coming Session. The drive for economy this year is very great. The money available to us, for instance, for the operation of buildings is about 20% below what private enterprise is paying to do the same job. So people criticize our windows because they are not washed and that sort of thing. It is because we haven't the money, not because we do not believe they should be washed. But this matter of the paintings, of course, is of growing importance because some of them are getting in pretty bad shape."

Mr. Finley suggested that, since the Government does not carry insurance on any of its property, one might look upon this in lieu of insurance.

Mr. Reynolds replied, "That is right. You have a question not only of portrait paintings, but also of murals which are on the walls of buildings.

"Recently we renovated the United States Court House and Post Office Building in Chicago. It has been in rather bad shape for years and we felt like demolishing it. We took over the operation about a year ago under the Reorganization Plan. In the court rooms there they had quite a few murals but no one paid any attention to them because they were so dirty and filthy you could not even recognize what they were. We have cleaned them up and really they are now very lovely, in color and everything else. Everybody notices them when they walk in. Before they never knew any paintings were there. To do the work, we made a contract with a restorer. Now we have an outstanding building. It would be a shame to tear it down."

Mr. Finley asked, "Mr. Reynolds, in case you do run into difficulty in securing an appropriation this year for a permanent establishment of a restorer's office, would it be easier for you to ask for an appropriation to do emergency work required by a restorer here in Washington and then perhaps out of that would grow a permanent office?"

Mr. Reynolds replied, "Well, I don't know. We are going to attempt to set up a minimum organization under the funds available to us. We get all our operating funds, including rentals, in a lump sum appropriation, and it runs into pretty big figures. I think we could make an allowance out of that for this work."

Mr. Finley said: "I am sure the Commission is very happy to hear that because it has been very much on my mind, and I think on the minds of other members of the Commission. We would be derelict in our duty if we allowed these valuable paintings to deteriorate." He asked Mr. Reynolds, "Would it help you for us to pass a resolution endorsing this?" Mr. Reynolds replied that it would.

Accordingly, on motion of Mr. Neild, the following Resolution was adopted:

> Resolved, that we endeavor to have all the paintings owned by the Government outside of museums restored in an Office with experts under the jurisdiction of the Office of Mr. Reynolds in the General Services Administration.

The Resolution was seconded and unanimously adopted. A letter was sent to Mr. Reynolds, accordingly (Exhibit E).

8. NEVIUS TRACT: Mr. Reynolds reported regarding the Nevius Tract:

> "I presumed the Commission was familiar with the Nevius Tract. It occupies a strategic location. It is on the axis of the Mall. It was purchased by the Veterans Administration for a Veterans Hospital. That project has been abandoned in that location and the property has been declared surplus or excess to the needs of the Veterans Administration. Under the processes of law, it comes to us as surplus property. We have control of that tract. And the people in Virginia are very anxious that the Government sell it so that commercial development can be put on it and restore the property to the tax rolls. Legislation was introduced in the last session of the Congress by Representative Smith of Virginia but it was not reported out. We have been opposing the sale of it and the President is very much opposed to the sale of it. We think something should be put over there which serves as a terminus of the Mall development, and we have been striving in various ways to find out what could be done.
>
> "Mr. Greensfelder from Saint Louis, who is a member of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, has conceived the idea that, and the President is very much interested in it, of having a shell over there and an auditorium, an open air auditorium for operas and things of that sort. The ground slopes slightly but not too much.

"Now we have been considering the idea of a building, possibly an office building, on that tract. Sketches have been prepared to see what could be done, with two towers, not too high, monumental in character, the portion of the tower to be without windows. It composes very well. I am afraid that unless something like that is done we shall be required to sell it, and then probably an apartment house development or something like that would go on that tract.

"Now, looking from the Washington Monument or the Capitol over into Virginia, something on that line is rather offensive and that would be most unfortunate. I have worked with Mr. Greensfelder quite a little on that project because he is very much enthused. I have not seen him since this probable structure was suggested. It is a restricted structure so that I cannot talk too much about it. But the portion you would see from the sky line is not a large mass, and it would serve as a fine terminus of the extended Mall in Virginia."

Mr. Finley asked about the acreage, and Mr. Reynolds replied that there are about 25 acres and it has an elevation of about 26 feet. Thereupon, Mr. Finley said, "I feel, and I am sure all the members of the Commission feel, that it is of great importance to retain that land in possession of the Government and I was wondering if perhaps the most useful thing and the easiest thing to do would be to make the tract a part of the Arlington National Cemetery; to keep it as a wooded area, which is a primary consideration, and keep it a possible site for a future monument."

Prof. Belluschi said, "Two suggested buildings there is a difficult thing,—to make a building monumental. The Capitol is in a sense such a building,—quite a monument, and if on the axis of the Mall you would have to compete with the Lincoln Memorial. I think it would be a serious mistake to dispose of the land, but if you went to the Committee and said that you are going to undertake building an office building there, then you have committed the site to an office building.

Mr. Reynolds felt he could not do that specifically, but that he is looking for an appropriate use of the land.

Chairman Finley said, "I think it should be retained and I would suggest you incorporate it in Arlington National Cemetery and put a monument on the site that

would nail it down. We are looking for a site for the Marine Memorial,—Mr. deWeldon has designed one appropriate for the site. It is an elevated site and the Memorial would look well there. You would also have a wooded area on the axis of the Capitol and the Lincoln Memorial. What do you think of that, Mr. Reynolds?"

Mr. Reynolds replied, "We have not been able to interest the Army at all in the use of the tract as part of the Arlington National Cemetery. I do not know why, because Arlington Cemetery is very much crowded. They are planning to extend the Cemetery eastward to the Potomac."

Mr. Finley remarked, "Even so, we own this land and it is contiguous to the Cemetery, so I could see no possible objection to incorporating it in Arlington National Cemetery. That offers an immediate solution, and I cannot believe that you would meet any opposition to doing that. I should like to recommend that the Nevius tract be included as part of the Arlington National Cemetery, and that ~~the Marine Memorial~~ consideration be given to placing ~~it~~ the Marine Memorial there. Would you be pleased with such a recommendation?"

Mr. Reynolds replied, "The only thing I am interested in at all, is that, having worked in the development of Washington now for some years, it seems to me it would be almost a calamity to see that tract developed for commercial use. I think it would be very, very short-sighted."

Chairman Finley remarked, "You remember the plan for the commercial building on the hill there behind the Lincoln Memorial? I remember this Commission had been concerned about the possibility of such a building for several years, as your office has been, and I think we ought to prevent that at all costs. It should not be a commercial site."

Mr. Reynolds replied, "It is awfully hard for anyone in my position to withhold sale of property when the law requires you to sell it, but when it becomes surplus you have to kind of drag your feet."

Mr. Neild suggested, "Couldn't we go on record as recommending or urging that it be retained for a future monument or other Government use, and that it be incorporated into the Arlington National Cemetery."

Professor Hudnut suggested making the Resolution in two parts:

First, it is essential for the preservation of the over-all Plan of the Mall that this property be retained for public use;

Second, we suggest as appropriate use the Arlington National Cemetery.

Accordingly, the Resolution was adopted, unanimously, and a report was sent to Mr. Reynolds (Exhibit F).

The Commission visited the location during the noon hour and were very much impressed with it, again urging that this Nevius Tract be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery and the site retained for a National Memorial. Also, out of the 25 acres there would be room for burial places.

9. KASS REALTY COMPANY LOTS, 25th and E Streets, NW.: The Commission conferred with Hon. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration, concerning the purchase of five lots at 25th and E Streets, Northwest, Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, in Square 33, which the Kass Realty Company owns and desires to use for building an apartment at the site. Attention was called to the fact that President Truman desires that these lots be purchased, since the location is in a restricted area, and also is to be preserved for future Government use.

The Secretary called attention to the fact that the owner of the lots is becoming impatient about the delay in purchasing the lots, and that most any day he may request a permit from the Inspector of Buildings to proceed with his apartment. The location is in the Shipstead-Luce Act area, and a design for the apartment, which the owner has submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts (somewhat more than a year ago) was not finally approved by the Commission but was thought to be generally acceptable.

Mr. Reynolds was aware of the importance of purchasing the lots without further delay, and said he was having a meeting with the owner of the lots during the afternoon to negotiate the purchase.

In connection with this subject, Mr. Reynolds stated that a few years ago he secured $2,000,000 from Congress to purchase the Heurich Brewery property, which is adjacent to the lots mentioned. Continuing, he said:

> "At the time the Heurich Brewing Company was going to build a new Brewery down there. So I went to the Heurich people and said if I can get money to buy your Brewery will you go somewhere else? They said sure. They held off until I got the money. I got the money. They had in the meantime bought a piece of property over at the South Capitol Street Bridge, but Housing got in, so in the meantime they have had to operate where they are. We have a gentleman's agreement that in due time they will build elsewhere. They own other properties in that area on which we are trying to reach an agreement, which is highly complext because at one time there was supposed to be a canal through that area—the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. The Government claims the canal bed. You would never think a canal was there at one time, and Heurich claim they own the land. A Mr. Loefler built the Riverside Statium on Heurich property, but since the Government also claims the land he pays rent to both Heurich and the Government. So as matters stand, the Director of the Budget wants us to tap the $2,000,000 to buy these lots owned by the Kass Realty Company."

The Secretary asked Mr. Reynolds, "Do you think there is a chance to buy those five lots?" Mr. Reynolds replied, "I told Kass three weeks ago we expect to buy them. I do not want to see an apartment there."

Mr. Neild asked, "Isn't it true that most of that area south of Virginia Avenue could be developed in the future for open space for public buildings? It seems suitable clear to the water front."

> Mr. Reynolds replied, "At one time we proposed a very large building over there where the Brewery is. It was to be for the Navy Department. The building at 21st Street and Virginia Avenue, west to 23d Street, was intended to be for the Army. Then with tunnels connecting the two buildings there was to be also a big lay out for bus terminals and so forth. President Roosevelt got very much interested in it and he wanted a covered walkway extending from the building at 21st and Virginia Avenue to the Navy Building at the Heurich Brewery site, with a ship basin at the waterfront, and midway he wanted a little office building on Constitution Avenue, because, he said, the Navy will go only half way and the Army will go only half way, so they can meet in the middle.

"With the atomic problems before us, with the transportation situation developing as it is, we believe it would be a mistake to erect a large building in the area at the Brewery site now. We would much prefer to see that the perimeter of the property along the river developed substantially the same as Constitution Avenue is developed west of Seventeenth Street. That is, small buildings like the Federal Reserve and the Pan American Union,--a series of nice small buildings, and if we do the same thing along the river up as far as Virginia Avenue it will be fine. Then the area in back could be landscaped for park and parking area.

"As to our modified plan of dispersal, we are going back to Congress to see if we can revive it, especially to get a circumference road about ten miles from the Capitol, starting at the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and connecting with the Shirley Highway going South. That serves many purposes. We could build then adjacent to that circumference road. It intersects every road leading out of Washington, from northeast, north, northwest to southwest. It would be a great help in the event of an attach on the city of Washington, which is doubtless the Number One target. You could have all the hospital setups, first aid and the like on this Highway. Several members of Congress are very much interested in this Highway, and Senator Case has introduced a Bill (S. 2209) on the subject.

"We think that some of these mass operations should be removed from the downtown area so that people do not have to come down in order to transact business. Working in these new buildings ten miles out they don't congest the downtown area. We want to keep the downtown buildings for those Departments and Agencies of the Government that have quite a lot of contact with the public. Some of these do not require much contact with the public."

Chairman Finley asked about the Old Naval Hospital buildings at 23rd Street and Constitution Avenue, saying, "Is it necessary to retain the hospital buildings now that we have a hospital at Bethesda?"

Mr. Reynolds replied, "They are being used for office buildings. We are operating them. In the future those buildings should be removed and nothing should be built there except a monument or something of that sort. That is the question I raised a while ago, that we should be thinking of what is going to happen to that area when our demand for space here in Washington starts dropping off. Maybe the property will become excess to needs. When it becomes excess to our needs under the law we are required to declare it excess; it then becomes surplus property and under the law we are required to sell it."

Chairman Finley asked if the site would be proper for a not too tall a building, such as a Music Hall for symphony concerts. "I don't think the site should be commercialized."

Mr. Reynolds replied, "I think transportation facilities would be too bad there. I agree with you that the site should not be commercialized. It is a problem that some one will have to face some day. It is a spot that can be used for a good many things and I thought it might be well to have it in mind, have the Commission keep it in mind."

In response to an inquiry about the acreage, Mr. Hunter said that the site comprises about 24 acres. There are a number of temporary war buildings in the locality, and the National Institute of Health has an old building there. Mr. Reynolds said he has been trying to interest the Monetary Bank people in a building like the Federal Reserve, near the waterfront and Virginia Avenue, "Before long there should be an Underpass at Washington Circle. Also we would like to see the large Temporary World War I buildings on Constitution Ave., removed."

A letter was sent to Mr. Reynolds, expressing appreciation that he proposes to buy the lots above-mentioned. Also, asking that he try to secure the Gallery adjacent to the Commission Room for exhibition purposes (Exhibit G).

10. REMOVAL OF TEMPORARY WAR BUILDINGS: Chairman Finley urged that first of all Mr. Reynolds dismantle "that horrible building at the head of Pennsylvania Avenue at Fourteenth Street, the Information booth that destroys the view of the Treasury Department.

Mr. Reynolds said that he has tried several times to get that building removed, but there is violent opposition to doing so. Continuing, he said:

> "Everyone is back of tearing down these temporary buildings as soon as possible, but at the present time we have every square foot of office space in Washington occupied. We have people that are working in too crowded quarters. The Pentagon, as big as it is, has about 2,000 more people than it should have for good working conditions. That isn't quite right, but it is obvious that, if some of the measures that are under consideration by the Congress go through, either the decentralization program or the dispersal program, or both, that is going to permit us to tear down a considerable number of these temporary buildings and we shall be very happy to keep this Number One priority of yours in mind."

Mr. Finley remarked, "I hope we shall all live to see it." Mr. Reynolds replied, "Oh, yes. Then also we expect that within 18 months the population of Washington will start dropping off. You will be over the hump on the NPA and the DPA. There will be a lot of Emergency employees that will be through with their work by that time."

Professor Belluschi said, "We know something about the dispersal and the decentralization programs. I just wonder when you plan an office building outside, say ten miles, and you have your roads and so on, have you considered all the things that go with that, such as habitations for the people who work there, or do they have to go from one part of town to the other?"

Mr. Reynolds replied, "If we can keep it reasonably close to the circumferential Highway, no housing is involved. The thing that defeated us before was that the N S R B insisted that we go out 20 miles. That introduced all kinds of problems. If it is ten miles out, along a circumferential Highway, a great many people would be much closer to work than they are now. The homes of these people would be near the new Government buildings.

11. SOLDIERS' HOME HOSPITAL BUILDING: Colonel Alan J. McCutchen, District Engineer, submitted a letter under date of December 20, 1951, (Exhibit H) and a design, Scheme A, embodying a suggestion made by the Commission at the meeting on November 29th, to push the center portion of the building back, as also a print of the original design, considered at the meeting of the Commission held on October 25th with changes suggested at that meeting. Prints of these designs were sent to the architect members of the Commission, who requested another conference before taking final action. Colonel McCutchen had pointed out that, while the scheme to push the central part of the building back was possible, it produced a bad building from a functional standpoint.

Accordingly, Colonel McCutchen, accompanied by his assistant Mr. Merrick and the architects, Messrs. Porter Senior and Junior were present, and there was a thorough discussion of the subject. The Commission felt it improved the design of the building to push the center portion back. However, the Commission took note of difficulties mentioned by Col. McCutchen. There was considerable discussion as to material for the exterior, and the use of limestone was strongly recommended.

The Commission finally agreed to acceptance of the original design, subject to some changes, which were explained to the architect, and to which he generally agreed.

The discussion on the subject is attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit H-1).

A report was sent to Colonel McCutchen, approving the design considered at the meeting of the Commission on October 25, 1951, subject to some changes recommended by the architect members of the Commission. (Exhibit H-2).

12. PORTRAIT OF FORMER CHAIRMAN GILMORE D. CLARKE: The Commission inspected a portrait of former Chairman Gilmore D. Clarke, by Sidney Dickinson, of New York. Chairman Finley said that members of the Commission of Fine Arts that served with Mr. Clarke contributed to a fund for the portrait. The Commission were pleased to receive the portrait and it was decided to provide a place for it in the Commission room.

13. FREER GALLERY OF ART: The Commission inspected a number of works of art submitted by Mr. Archibald G. Wenley, Director, proposed for purchase and approved them (Exhibit I).

14. GOVERNMENT AND ART: The Commission was in conference with Colonel Paul Hyde Bonner, 3034 Que Street, Northwest, on the subject of drafting the testimony in the four volumes of the Commission on the subject in narrative form.

Colonel Bonner presented a draft of Volume One (Exhibit J), with the request that the Commission make comments and suggestions concerning it.

Colonel Bonner said he would proceed with similar work on the next three volumes and if possible have it ready for the Commission at the next meeting.

The Commission enjoyed the discussion with Colonel Bonner, and were satisfied with the work thus far done.

The Commission thought it desirable to include a statement on Federal Communications, which would include the Radio and possibly Television. The subject is to be considered at the next meeting (Exhibit K).

15. NEXT MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS: The Commission decided to hold the next meeting in Washington on Tuesday, February 26, 1952.

The Commission adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The Commission had luncheon at the National Gallery of Art, with Colonel Bonner as guest.

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D.C.

January 11, 1952

Dear Mr. President:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, which was held yesterday, I told the members of the memorandum which I had received from you, enclosing a copy of a memorandum which you had received from the Secretary of State concerning the proposed gift of a carillon of forty bells from the people of The Netherlands to the people of the United States.

The members of the Commission were greatly impressed by this gesture of friendship on the part of The Netherlands and are happy to recommend acceptance of this generous offer, with the understanding that certain details in connection with this offer should be agreed to on the part of the United States Government.

It was not clear to the Commission whether or not The Netherlands Government would make provision for the erection of a tower in Washington, in which the carillon could be installed. If the tower is to be erected by the United States Government, funds should be provided for this purpose. If the tower is to be similar in height and design to the Bok Tower in Florida, such a tower, in the opinion of the Commission, would probably cost about a million dollars. The members of the Commission were of the opinion that the tower should be given an important location, preferably on public grounds in the District of Columbia, for which an Act of Congress would be necessary; and also that provision should be made for the carillon to be played at stated intervals.

The Commission will be happy to be of assistance in finding a suitable location for the tower and to render assistance to the Secretary of State, or other Government officials, in connection with the erection of the tower and the installation of the carillon in Washington.

Faithfully yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley

The President
The White House

def/f

EXHIBIT A

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington, D.C. - Wash. 8.D.

January 11, 1924

Dear Mr. President:

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, which was held yesterday, I told the members of the memorandum which I had received from you, enclosing a copy of a memorandum which you had received from the secretary of State concerning the proposed gift of a carillon or bells from the people of The Netherlands to the people of the United States.

The members of the Commission were greatly impressed by this gesture of friendship on the part of The Netherlands and are happy to recommend acceptance of this generous offer, with the understanding that details in connection with this offer should be agreed to on the part of the United States Government.

It was not clear to the Commission whether or not the Netherlands Government would make provision for the erection of a tower in Washington, in which the carillon could be installed. If the tower is to be erected by the United States Government, funds should be provided for this purpose. If the tower is to be similar in height and design to the Peh Tower in Florida, such a tower, in the opinion of the Commission, would probably cost about 4 million dollars. The members of the Commission were of the opinion that the tower should be given an important location, preferably on public grounds in the District of Columbia. For this an act of Congress would be necessary and also that provision should be made for the carillon to be played at stated intervals.

The Commission will be happy to be of assistance in finding a suitable location for the tower and to render assistance to the Secretary of State, or other Government officials, in connection with the erection of the tower and the installation of the carillon in Washington.

Faithfully yours,

(Sgd.)
Charles E. Finney

The President
The White House

eaf/f

COPY 1

COPY

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Washington 25, D.C.

December 17, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

In reference to the letter of November 19, 1951, signed by Mr. Caemmerer, Secretary to the Commission, which was written as a result of a telephone conversation with Mr. Phillips of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial Association and Mr. Caemmerer, I wish to point out some difficulties that have been encountered by the Mint as a result of the Commission's approving a design for a coin prior to the Mint's having accepted the design.

The act authorizing the coin states, among other things, that it shall be: "* * * of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury * * *". It has been the practice in the past for us to submit such a design to you for an expression of opinion as to its artistic merits.

In the case of the present coin, I received a telephone call at my home during a weekend from Mr. Phillips, stating that he had a design of a coin that he intended to deliver to Philadelphia on the following Monday morning and requested that I give Philadelphia the authority to manufacture the coin. I told Mr. Phillips that before authorizing Philadelphia to make the coin, it would be necessary for the Mint to secure approval of the design from the Commission of Fine Arts and the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Phillips said he already had approval from the Commission of Fine Arts. I told him that I would have to secure a letter from the Commission. Mr. Phillips said that he would get in touch with the Commission of Fine Arts early Monday and would get such a letter from them. As a result, the letter of November 19, enclosing a copy of a letter of November 15, addressed to Mr. Phillips, was sent to this office. Mr. Phillips then delivered the designs to the Philadelphia Mint, and I requested the Mint Engraver to give me in writing an approval of the design so that I could request the Secretary for his approval.

The Engraver stated that the designs were unsuitable for coinage, especially the reverse side. The center part of the design, the map of the United States, was too high in relief and was much higher than the border of the design. If a coin had been made using this design, it would have "rocked" on the map of the United States and would not have stacked properly, inasmuch as a coin should rest on its outer rim. He said that the lettering was terrible and could not be reproduced. Also, with the United States in high relief on one side and the heads of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver in high relief on the other side,

EXHIBIT B

COPY

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Washington 25, D.C.

December 17, 1951

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Sir:

In reference to the letter of November 19, 1951, signed by Mr. Gammerer, secretary, to the Commission, which was written as a result of a telephone conversation with Mr. Phillips of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial Association and Mr. Gammerer, I wish to point out some difficulties that have been encountered by the Mint as a result of the Commission's approving a design for a coin prior to the Mint's having accepted the design.

The act authorizing the coin states, among other things, that it shall be: "* * * of a special appropriate design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury * * *". It has been the practice in the past for us to submit such a design to you for an expression of opinion as to its artistic merits.

In the case of the present coin, I received a telephone call at my home during a weekend from Mr. Phillips, stating that he had a design of a coin that he intended to deliver to Philadelphia on the following Monday morning and requested that I give Philadelphia the authority to manufacture the coin. I told Mr. Phillips that before authorizing Philadelphia to make the coin, it would be necessary for the Mint to secure approval of the design from the Commission of Fine Arts and the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Phillips said he already had approval from the Commission of Fine Arts. I told him that I would have to secure a letter from the Commission. Mr. Phillips said that he would get in touch with the Commission of Fine Arts early Monday and would get such a letter from them. As a result, the letter of November 19, enclosing a copy of a letter of November 15, addressed to Mr. Phillips, was sent to this office. Mr. Phillips then delivered the designs to the Philadelphia Mint, and I requested the Mint Director to give me in writing an approval of the design so that I could request the Secretary for his approval.

The Director stated that the designs were unsuitable for coinage, especially the reverse side. The center part of the design, the map of the United States, was too high in relief and was much higher than the border of the design. If a coin has been made using this design, it would have "rocked" on the map of the United States and would not have stacked properly, because as a coin should rest on the outer rim. He said that the lettering was terrible and could not be reproduced. Also, with the raised states in high relief on one side and the heads of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver in high relief on the other side,

it would be impossible to coin such a piece, as the metal could not flow into the center of the die and still leave a uniform surface on the remainder of the coin.

You understand, of course, that a design may have high artistic merit and still be unsuitable for coinage. A coin design must be such that it will be suitable for mass production on coinage presses. The technicalities involved in the manufacture of coin and the designs which are appropriate for coinage differ materially from those involved with the manufacture of individual medals for instance. In this case, however, the design that was submitted to us did not meet our standard as to artistic merit. We would never have submitted it to the Commission of Fine Arts in its present form for approval. However, in view of the fact that it had been approved by the Commission, we did not want to embarrass the Commission by making an issue of the design.

I discussed with Mr. Phillips the impossibility of coining this design and in my discussion I discovered that the design that had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts may have been altered. Frankly, I do not know the exact story, but I believe that Mr. deWeldon approved the design with an inscription, against which the State Department interposed an objection. I believe the reverse was completely remodeled after Mr. deWeldon approved it. One thing appears certain, and that is that the inscriptions and the lettering were changed. However, I received a picture of the model as submitted to us, and such picture, it is my understanding, came from the Commission of Fine Arts. What confuses the whole situation is that the letter from the Commission of Fine Arts approving the design was delivered to this office by Mr. Phillips together with the photographs.

It has been necessary for our artist to change the relief and lettering on the reverse design of the proposed coin. This has been most embarrassing, in view of the fact that Mr. Phillips had in his possession a letter from the Commission of Fine Arts approving the design.

In the future, in order to produce coins technically as well as artistically meritorious, it is suggested that we in the Mint first have the opportunity to pass upon a model before it is approved by your Commission.

Very truly yours,

S/ Leland Howard
t/ LELAND HOWARD
Acting Director of the Mint

LH:met

it would be impossible to coin such a piece, as the metal could not flow into the center of the die and still leave a uniform surface on the remainder of the coin.

You understand, of course, that a design may have high artistic merit and still be unsuitable for coinage. A coin design must be such that it will be suitable for mass production on coinage presses. The technicalities involved in the manufacture of coin and the designs which are appropriate for coinage differ materially from those involved with the manufacture of individual medals for instance. In this case, however, the design that was submitted to us did not meet our standard as to artistic merit. We would never have submitted it to the Commission of Fine Arts in its present form for approval. However, in view of the fact that it had been approved by the Commission, we did not want to embarrass the Commission by raising an issue of the design.

I discussed with Mr. Phillips the impossibility of coining this design and in my discussion I discovered that the design that had been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts may have been altered. Frankly, I do not know the exact story, but I believe that Mr. Weinman approved the design with an inscription, against which the State Department interposed an objection. I believe the reverse was completely remodeled after Mr. Weinman approved it. The thing appears certain, and that is that the inscriptions and the lettering were changed. However, I received a picture of the model as submitted to us, and such picture, it is my understanding, came from the Commission of Fine Arts. What confuses the whole situation is that the letter from the Commission of Fine Arts approving the design was delivered to this office by Mr. Phillips together with the photographs.

It has been necessary for our artist to change the relief and lettering on the reverse design of the proposed coin. This has been most embarrassing. In view of the fact that Mr. Phillips had in his possession a letter from the Commission of Fine Arts approving the design.

In the future, in order to produce coins technically as well as artistically meritorious, it is suggested that we in the Mint first have the opportunity to pass upon a model before it is approved by your Commission.

Very truly yours,

R\ Nellie Forward
T\ Nellie FORWARD
Acting Director of the Mint

Enclosed

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

January 14, 1952

Dear Mr. Howard:

Your letter of December 17, 1951, protesting against the action taken recently by the Commission of Fine Arts in approving the models for the George Carver-Booker T. Washington Memorial Coin, was carefully considered by the Commission at their meeting on January 10, 1952.

The Commission regret very much the procedure followed in this matter. The Commission have for many years followed the procedure that you outlined, namely, that models should first be approved by the Bureau of the Mint before submission to the Commission of Fine Arts. In this instance the Commission acted under a misapprehension, due to the insistence by Mr. Phillips of the Memorial Coin Committee that haste was necessary so that the coin could be minted before the end of the year, 1951. This, we understand now, is not the case.

Mr. deWeldon, the sculptor member of this Commission, approved the models when they were submitted to him by Mr. Phillips, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Mint, and a copy of the letter of approval was thereupon sent to you.

I assure you that, in the future, the procedure you recommend will be followed by this Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Honorable Leland Howard
Acting Director of the Mint
Treasury Department
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B-1

The Commission of Fine Arts

January 21, 1952

Dear Mr. Lovett:

Your letter of December 27, 1951, on behalf against the action taken recently by the Commission of Fine Arts in approving the models for the Jefferson-Lincoln T. Washington Memorial Arch, was carefully considered by the Commission at their meeting on January 10, 1952.

The Commission regret very much the procedure followed in this matter. The Commission have not may have followed the procedure that you outlined, namely, that models should first be approved by the Secretary of the Navy before submission to the Commission of Fine Arts. In this instance the Commission acted under a misapprehension, due to the assurance of Mr. Phillips of the Secretary John Lawrence that the necessary so that the work could be rushed before the end of the year, 1951. This, in accordance with, is not the case.

Mr. Secretary, the sculptor member of the Commission approved the models with the understanding that the Navy Department would be pleased to see the models before the commencement of the work, and to have the benefit of a conference with the Commission, which no doubt would be given.

I feel sure that, in the future, you will not approve models without the knowledge and approval of the Commission.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gen.

Gerald F. Taylor,

Secretary.

Honorable Lewis Herman
Acting Director of the Mint
Treasury Department
Washington, D. C.

COPY

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Washington 25, D.C.

January 21, 1952

Mr. David E. Finley, Chairman
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Finley:

Please give no further thought to the incident regarding approval by the Fine Arts Commission of the Booker T. Washington coin design. You and Mr. deWeldon have explained the matter fully. It is clear that we have a complete understanding as to the procedures to be followed in the future.

While the New Year is yet young, please accept for yourself and your associates on the Commission my best of good wishes.

With assurances of high esteem, I am

Very truly yours,

Sgd.
NELLIE TAYLOE ROSS
Director of the Mint

NTR:met

EXHIBIT B-2

COPY

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Washington 25, D.C.

January 21, 1952

Mr. David S. Finley, Director
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Finley:

Please give no further thought to the instrument regarding approval by the Fine Arts Commission of the Booker T. Washington coin design. You and Mr. Gottlieb have explained the matter fully. It is clear that we have a complete understanding as to the procedure to be followed in the future.

While the New Year is yet young, please accept for yourself and your associates on the Commission my best of good wishes.

With assurances of high esteem, I am

Very truly yours,

Sgd.
DOUGLAS DILLON Secy.
Director of the Mint

WTE:mct

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 14, 1952.

Dear Dr. Wetmore:

With reference to your request for names of sculptors who would be competent to execute a bust of the late General William Mitchell, I am pleased to inform you that I took up this matter with the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held on January 10th.

The Commission recommend any one of the following four sculptors:

Mr. Walker K. Hancock,
Lanesville, Gloucester, Mass.

Mr. Herbert Haseltine,
20 Impasse Raffet, Rue Raffet,
Paris XVIe, France.

Mr. William Zorach,
276 Hicks Street,
Brooklyn 2, New York.

Mr. Paul Manship,
319 East 72nd Street,
New York, N. Y.

If we can be of further help to you in this matter, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Dr. Alexander Wetmore, Secretary,
The Smithsonian Institution,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 14, 1920.

Dear Dr. Wetmore:

With reference to your request for names of sculptors who would be competent to execute a bust of the late General William Mitchell, I am pleased to inform you that I took up this matter with the Commission of Fine Arts as a meeting held on January 10th.

The Commission recommend any one of the following four sculptors:

Mr. Walter K. Hancock,
Lanesville, Gloucester, Mass.

Mr. Herbert Haseltine,
20 Impasse Dantes, Rue Antibes,
Paris XVIe, France.

Mr. William Ahrens,
276 Fifth Street,
Brooklyn 2, New York.

Mr. Paul Manship,
210 East 72nd Street,
New York, N. Y.

If we can be of further help to you in this matter, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

Secy.
Charles E. Fairman,
Chairman.

Dr. Alexander Wetmore, Secretary,
The Smithsonian Institution,
Washington D. C.

COPIES:

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 31, 1952

Dear Mr. Hunter:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 10, 1952, considered the design which you submitted for a proposed Pharmacy Building for Howard University. The Commission took note of the statements made by the architect, Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson.

The architect members of the Commission regretted the narrowness of the space between the Pharmacy Building and the adjoining building, which gave the appearance of an alley, and felt it might improve the situation if a garden wall was introduced to visually join the two buildings. Consideration should also be given to a landscape plan for the building.

The Commission recommends that a model be made of the entrance doorway which may help the architects to improve its design. Subject to the above considerations, the Commission approved the design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Lester L. Hunter,
Acting Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Service,
General Services Administration,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Jan. 31, 3.

January 31, 1952

Dear Mr. Hunter:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 10, 1952, considered the design which you submitted for a proposed Pharmacy Building for Howard University. The Commission took note of the statements made by the architect, Mr. Hilyard R. Robinson.

The architect members of the Commission regretted the narrowness of the space between the Pharmacy Building and the adjoining building, which gave the appearance of an alley, and felt it might improve the situation if a garden wall was introduced to visually join the two buildings. Consideration should also be given to a landscape plan for the building.

The Commission recommends that a model be made of the entrance doorway which may help the architects to improve the design. Subject to the above considerations, the Commission approves the design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Mr. Hester R. Hunter,
Acting Supervising Architect,
Public Buildings Service,
General Services Administration,
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT D

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Department - D. C.

January 16, 1952

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were very happy to have you meet with us on January 10th and to discuss the possibility of establishing an office for the restoration of paintings owned by the United States Government but not including those in the collections of the museums. The members of the Commission are particularly glad to know that the General Services Administration is in favor of establishing such an office and that it would be under your jurisdiction where the work could be carried on under satisfactory conditions.

We realize that some time may be required to work out the details, but hope that definite arrangements can be made during this fiscal year, as many of the paintings are badly in need of repair.

I shall be glad to show you at your convenience the office maintained in the National Gallery for the conservation of paintings. You may be interested in seeing the equipment and the methods used by our Restorer.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C.

def/f

EXHIBIT E

The Commission of Fine Arts

Interior Department - D. C.

January 16, 1952

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were very happy to have you meet with us on January 10th and to discuss the possibility of establishing an office for the restoration of paintings owned by the United States Government but not hanging there in the collections of the museums. The members of the Commission are particularly glad to know that the General Services Administration is in favor of establishing such an office and feel it would be great for jurisdiction where the work could be carried on under satisfactory conditions.

We realize that some time may be required to work out the details, but once that initial arrangement is out of the during this fiscal year, as many of the paintings are badly in need of repair.

I shall be glad to show you at your convenience the office maintained in the National Gallery for the conservation of paintings. You may be interested in seeing the equipment and the methods used by our restorer.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Lloyd.
Gaylord B. Tucker
Secretary

Honorable E. [illegible] Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
General Services Administration
Washington, D. C.

ldt\ft

Attachment

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 16, 1952

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts, at the meeting of January 10th, were greatly interested in hearing from you that the disposition of the Nevius tract, comprising about twenty-five acres and adjoining the Arlington National Cemetery, is under the jurisdiction of the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration.

The Commission have long been interested in the development of this property which, as you know, was bought by the United States Government for the purpose of erecting a hospital for the Veterans Administration on the site. When plans for the erection of such a building were under consideration the members expressed regret that the site was to be used for a large building, but were glad that the land would remain in the ownership of the Federal Government.

In view of the fact that the Nevius tract is on the axis of the Mall and can be seen from the Lincoln Memorial, it is of great importance as related to the central composition of the plan of Washington. The Commission of Fine Arts, at their last meeting, expressed the view that this tract should remain in the ownership of the Federal Government and should be made a part of Arlington National Cemetery. They also expressed the opinion that the tract would provide an ideal site for an important national memorial.

The Commission of Fine Arts, therefore, strongly protest the sale of the Nevius tract as surplus property and in support of this position have adopted the following resolutions:

1. It is essential for the overall plan of the National Capital that this property be retained in the possession of the United States Government. It is directly on the Mall axis and is in clear view of the Lincoln Memorial.

2. The Nevius Tract should be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery. A part of the tract would be an ideal site for a great National Memorial from the terrace of which a most remarkable view of the National Capital could be obtained.

If we can be of further assistance to you in this matter I hope you will let us know.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
General Services Building
Washington, D. C.
def/f

EXHIBIT F

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 16, 1932

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts, at the meeting of January 15th, were greatly interested in hearing from you that the disposition of the Levina tract, comprising about twenty-five acres and adjoining the Arlington National Cemetery, is under the jurisdiction of the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration.

The Commission have long been interested in the development of this property which, as you know, was bought by the United States Government for the purpose of erecting a hospital for the Veterans Administration on the site. When plans for the erection of such a building were under consideration the members expressed regret that the site was to be used for a large building, but were glad that the land would remain in the ownership of the Federal Government.

In view of the fact that the Levina tract is on the axis of the Mall and can be seen from the Lincoln Memorial, it is of great importance as related to the central composition of the plan of Washington. The Commission of Fine Arts, at their last meeting, expressed the view that this tract should remain in the ownership of the Federal Government and should be made a part of Arlington National Cemetery. They also expressed the opinion that the tract would provide an ideal site for an important national memorial.

The Commission of Fine Arts, therefore, strongly protest the sale of the Levina tract as surplus property and in support of this position have adopted the following resolutions:

1. It is essential for the overall plan of the National Capital that this property be retained in the possession of the United States Government. It is directly on the Mall axis and is in clear view of the Lincoln Memorial.

2. The Levina Tract should be made a part of the Arlington National Cemetery. A part of the tract would be an ideal site for a great National Memorial from the terrace of which a most remarkable view of the National Capital could be obtained.

If we can be of further assistance to you in this matter I hope you will let us know.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Honorable M. O. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings
General Services Building
Washington, D. C.
dsf/f

Sincerely yours,

Eng.
David A. Finley
Chairman

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 17, 1952

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

After your meeting with the Commission of Fine Arts on January 10th, the members expressed their satisfaction in having an opportunity to talk with you concerning so many matters of mutual interest and also of great importance in the development of the city of Washington. The Commission felt that it was a very valuable session and hope that we may have other opportunities in getting together and exchanging ideas, as we did last week.

We are glad to know that you do not favor the erection of an apartment building near the Heurich Brewery, as had been contemplated, and that you are negotiating for the purchase of certain lots upon which the apartment building was to be erected. The President, as you know, hoped that these lots could be purchased at an early date since they are in the area occupied by offices of the Department of State.

The Commission would like to have your assistance in connection with another matter that gives us concern. The Commission has had in its custody for many years models, pictures, and designs pertaining to the development of the Plan of Washington. In fact, the Commission became the custodian of the plans of the McMillan Commission in 1910, when the Commission of Fine Arts was created by the Congress. Since that time the Commission has accumulated many objects relating to the city of Washington which would be of interest if they could be displayed so that visitors to the city could see them. In order to accomplish this the Commission would like to be given the use of the Gallery adjoining the Commissions' rooms, which was assigned to the Commission of Fine Arts when we first occupied our present rooms in 1937.

It was expected that this Gallery would be used for the plans and models which were shown during the Sesquicentennial Exhibition in the Corcoran Gallery of Art and which were returned to the Commission in December, 1950. These plans and models are, at present, in the Commission rooms where they cannot be seen to advantage and also militate against the efficient use of the quarters assigned to the Commission. This exhibit material is, in our opinion, of value, as well as of historical interest, and we would be most grateful if you could arrange to have it properly exhibited in the Gallery adjoining the Commission rooms.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable W. E. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings Service
General Services Building
Washington D. C.
def/f

EXHIBIT G

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 17, 1922

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

After your meeting with the Commission of Fine Arts on January 10th, the members expressed their satisfaction in having an opportunity to talk with you concerning so many matters of mutual interest and also of great importance in the development of the city of Washington. The Commission felt that it was a very valuable session and hope that we may have other opportunities in getting together and exchanging ideas, as we did last week.

We are glad to know that you do not favor the erection of an apartment building near the Heurich Brewery, as had been contemplated, and that you are negotiating for the purchase of certain lots upon which the apartment building was to be erected. The President, as you know, hoped that these lots could be purchased at an early date since they are in the area occupied by offices of the Department of State.

The Commission would like to have your assistance in connection with another matter that gives us concern. The Commission has had in its custody for many years models, pictures, and designs pertaining to the development of the Plan of Washington. In fact, the Commission became the custodian of the plans of the L'Enfant Commission in 1910, when the Commission of Fine Arts was created by the Congress. Since that time the Commission has accumulated many objects relating to the city of Washington which would be of interest if they could be displayed to that visitors to the city could see them. In order to accomplish this the Commission would like to be given the use of the Gallery adjoining the Commissions' rooms, which was assigned to the Commission of Fine Arts when we first occupied our present rooms in 1917.

It was expected that this Gallery would be used for the plans and models which were shown during the Sesquicentennial Exhibition in the Corcoran Gallery of Art and which were returned to the Commission in December, 1920. These plans and models are, at present, in the Commission rooms where they cannot be seen to advantage and also militate against the efficient use of the quarters assigned to the Commission. This exhibit material is, in our opinion, of value, as well as of historical interest, and we would be most grateful if you could arrange to have it properly exhibited in the Gallery adjoining the Commission rooms.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley
Chairman.

Honorable W. M. Reynolds
Commissioner of Public Buildings Service
General Service Building
Washington D. C.
def/f

EXHIBIT C

COPY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS, U. S. ARMY
First & Douglas Streets, N. W.
Washington 25, D. C.

600.1 U. S. Soldiers' Home (NAWAS) 20 December 1951

The Commission of Fine Arts
19th & C Streets, N. W.
South Interior Dept. Bldg., Rm. 7000
Washington 25, D. C.

Attention: Mr. Caemmerer

Re: Contract DA-49-080-Eng-628
Hospital Ward Wing

Gentlemen:

Reference is made to Fine Arts Commissions' meeting on 27 November 1951 at which time this office and its Architect presented a revised plan for the construction of a Hospital Ward Wing at the U. S. Soldiers' Home. The plans had been prepared to comply with comments made by the Commission on a previous submittal on 25 October 1951. The Commission indicated that the previous comments had been complied with in the revisions.

A further idea was advanced by the Commission to remove the massive concrete core from the west elevation of the building and substituting therefore continuous bedrooms along the west face of the entire building. As this idea was new the architect agreed to make studies to secure the results desired by the Commission. There were apparent disadvantages to this scheme from a functional standpoint but a thorough study of the effect was to be made by the architect.

These studies have been made and every effort exerted to determine the least detrimental effect possible on interior functioning of the Hospital Ward Wing. Transmitted herewith is Scheme "A" showing the best possible rearrangement of the interior to comply with the desire expressed by the Commission in their meeting of 27 November 1951 and Scheme "B" showing the revised exterior treatment of the building in accordance with the Commissions' comment of 25 October 1951.

EXHIBIT H

600.1 U. S. Soldiers' Home (Con't.)

Conferences with the Governor of the U. S. Soldiers' Home and the architect have resulted in a meeting of minds that the operation of the building will be severely handicapped by Scheme "A" and it would not be a good plan from a functional standpoint. Some of the disadvantages are:

(1) The distances from the bedrooms to the necessary administrative, service and toilet facilities would be increased about seventy (70) feet.

(2) The nurses' station controlling the wing would necessarily be located outside of the protected area to function under normal conditions.

(3) A bottleneck would be created by having only one (1) entrance to the protected area through which all patients must be evacuated.

(4) The cost of the building would be increased by reason of additional cubic footage required to accomplish the desires of the Commission.

(5) The east elevation of the building would present the identical concrete block under this treatment and both east and west elevations are equally important in the ultimate plan.

It is noted from the minutes of 29 November that the Chairman of the Commission agreed with Mr. Hudnut's statement to the Architect that "if after examination of the plan and your clients wishes you find that this pushing back change involves too great a sacrifice of time and effort...the Commission should not insist upon pushing it back." This examination has been made and the Governor of the U. S. Soldiers' Home decided that it was not feasible and that Scheme "B" should be followed in completion of the design and construction.

Four (4) copies of Schemes "A" and "B" are presented herewith for such comments as the Commission feels are pertinent. In the meantime the planning will be continued on Scheme "B" so that contract and construction may follow as soon as possible in accordance with the requirements of the U. S. Soldiers' Home as previously stated by the Governor, General Haislip.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
Alan J. McCutchen
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

Incl:
4 cys ea of
Schemes "A" and "B".

Conferences with the Governor of the U. S. Soldiers' Home and the architect have resulted in a meeting of minds that the operation of the building will be severely handicapped by Scheme "A" and it would not be a good plan from a functional standpoint. Some of the disadvantages are:

(1) The distances from the bedrooms to the necessary administrative, service and toilet facilities would be increased about seventy (70) feet.

(2) The nurses' station controlling the wing would necessarily be located outside of the protected area to function under normal conditions.

(3) A bottleneck would be created by having only one (1) entrance to the protected area through which all patients must be evacuated.

(4) The cost of the building would be increased by reason of additional cubic footage required to accomplish the desires of the Commission.

(5) The east elevation of the building would present the identical concrete block under this treatment and both east and west elevations are equally important in the ultimate plan.

It is noted from the minutes of 29 November that the Chairman of the Commission agreed with Mr. Hudson's statement to the architect that "if after examination of the plan and your clients wishes you find that this pushing each change involves too great a sacrifice of time and effort...the Commission should not insist upon pushing it back." This examination has been made and the Governor of the U. S. Soldiers' Home decided that it was not feasible and that Scheme "B" should be followed in completion of the design and construction.

Four (4) copies of Schemes "A" and "B" are presented herewith for such comments as the Commission feels are pertinent. In the meantime the planning will be continued on Scheme "B" so that contract and construction may follow as soon as possible in accordance with the requirements of the U. S. Soldiers' Home as previously stated by the Governor, General Smith.

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
Alan J. Kostyshen
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

Incl:
4 cys ea of
Schemes "A" and "B".

REVISED DESIGN FOR SOLDIERS' HOME HOSPITAL BUILDING, JANUARY 10, 1952

(The Commission was joined by Colonel McCutchen, Messrs. Porter, Senior and Junior, and Merrick.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: We have the revised design for the Soldiers' Home Hospital Building.

Would you like to open the discussion, Colonel?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: We are here at your request. Perhaps it would be best that you--

MR. CAEMMERER: We received your letter, Colonel.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Will you open the discussion as to what you would like to get from us.

MR. NEILD: Colonel, what is the proposal now for facing material on the building as presently designed?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: The present proposal is for the cast stone. However, we would like to get the feeling of the Commission on that. I think the point that was determined last time was that we felt there should be no attempt to use two materials. The first proposal was for cast stone in the center and limestone in the wings. That, I believe we agreed, was not the thing that we wanted to do. The architect has proposed that we use cast stone throughout.

However, if the Commission is of the opinion that the limestone throughout would be a better surface material, we will accept that. The Governor of the Soldiers' Home has indicated that he has no preference one way or the other on that point.

MR. NEILD: Mr. Porter, is there any reason why that cannot be done structurally to comply with the opinion?

MR. PORTER, SR.: I do not believe it would be as sound structurally as the cast stone.

MR. NEILD: You refer to the facing of that bombproof section?

MR. PORTER: Yes, I see it in this way. The center portion of the building which is the bombproof area is something we have not done too much of, in the way of construction of the atomic center with a different material than the wings. Now I had in mind, if you remember, the first story carried around in cast stone and it extends out beyond the building somewhat—I had in mind carrying the center portion down of the cast stone and the first floor of the cast stone and then filling in the wings above that with the limestone.

The use of two materials to give it a little different texture at the base of the building and the center portion.

I think you have got a material in the cast stone which is ideally suited for an atomic center.

MR. de WELDON: Has that material been tested?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. NEILD: What do you think in the matter of a few years would be the difference in the weathering of the two materials, one is more porous than the other. I imagine your limestone is somewhat more porous than the concrete would be. Consequently, it will probably discolor more.

MR. PORTER: Of course we do have around the city a rather interesting thing, you can see it down along downtown buildings in the area, what with the oil burners and oil, the limestone buildings do pick up a tremendous amount of stain.

MR. NEILD: I will ask you one more question then. Concerning that bombproof core of the building, we have discussed at all times the veneering of the surface. Suppose you enclosed that within a wall constructed similarly to the exterior

construction of the rest of the building. Why veneering, put a wall in front of it.

MR. PORTER: Well of course in developing these buildings--

MR. NEILD: I do not mean separate.

MR. PORTER: In developing these buildings we are charged with trying to build them on today's market with a certain amount of money. So far we have been rather fortunate, when building started we came within our allotment there. In thinking of the center core of that building, you would have to build a concrete wall and use two sets of forms. The scheme that I had in mind is to use the cast stone as the outside form, thereby eliminating that outside form and only having to put the one form in the back for the building walls.

That is what I tried to illustrate with that little sample I had here last week.

MR. NEILD: It is my own opinion, my own desire, and I believe the majority of the Commission feel as I do that that building should be surfaced with natural limestone because your other buildings have been and will be surfaced with limestone.

MR. PORTER: I go along with you with that. The only thing, my feeling was that if I could take the center portion in this cast stone, tying it to part of that atomic center and carrying it down so it won't stick out like a sore thumb. Carry it down to the first floor and put in limestone above, I would have the building in character when everything was completed and when several other buildings go out there it would be more in character by carrying the cast stone into somewhat the same texture. I cannot do it absolutely, but somewhat the same texture and I believe you would have a very attractive thing.

I am using up here on this mosque, up on Massachusetts Avenue, I am using a combination of the Alabama limestone there and the cast stone. That of course was done to get the color.

COL. McCUTCHEN: Will the Commission as a whole express itself, then in desiring natural limestone?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I will express myself as strongly as I can on the point that the mixing of the two materials is not good design. The contrast, in this case is undesirable or perhaps you say you are trying to match the two materials--

MR. PORTER: Not trying to match but come somewhere--

MR. BELLUSCHI: You either have strong contrast between two materials and it has to be done successfully at times or else you must use the same materials to preserve unity.

MR. PORTER: Don't you feel that you could get rather pleasing contrast by the use of two materials?

MR. BELLUSCHI: No. That is the only thing I really feel very strongly about. My personal prejudice goes along with Mr. Neild on that. I would like to see Indiana limestone used. It is a personal prejudice based on my experience with cast stone which has not been good in the way it weathers, and the way it fluoresces, if not properly cured. Perhaps these people have solved the problem of pouring a cast stone which has more variety and beauty than limestone.

I am projudiced, and I would not want to be on record as saying not to use cast stone but I would say: do not mix them.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: I think we are in thorough agreement that mixing proposal has been abandoned.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Not according with Mr. Porter's last statement.

MR. PORTER: I am hard to knock down.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: At the last meeting, I believe you will recall, we said we would have one or the other and your study in the meantime had developed a partiality for the cast stone. So we want to determine now which of those two is the preference of the Commission and we will abide by that.

MR. de WELDON: We asked for the tests of limestone and cast stone by the Bureau of Standards or some other agency.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: You were speaking of another building, the Institute of Pathology and I believe, of your letter to the Defense Department. Is that not correct?

MR. MERRICK: I think so.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: We have never seen that letter except by a courtesy copy sent to us by Mr. Caemmerer.

MR. de WELDON: Same conditions would apply in this building.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: What I meant was we have not had any authority or directive to us to pursue that or ask the Bureau of Standards to develop it for us.

MR. de WELDON: Mr. Porter said before that tests were made. But we have not seen the results.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Maybe you did not understand what the question was, Mr. Porter, about the tests.

MR. PORTER: I believe Admiral Ben Morreel tested that material quite some years ago. Quite some extensive tests were made on it.

MR. de WELDON: Could we get the results of the tests?

MR. PROTER: I think I can get them for you, yes.

MR. HUDNUT: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to try the patience of the architects too far because I think they have been pretty cooperative but I could not help asking for one more opportunity to review the objections of this scheme and see if

they could be met because we think that is so much nicer to have that broad expanse of windows there, get that service element out of the way and I wonder if you would show us where they come in with the plans before us and see if we could make some other suggestions.

MR. PORTER: The big objection that I saw to it, it completely disturbed the requirements of the authorities at Soldiers' Home. That is, the Medical Superintendent of the building, there, General McDonald.

And again, the main thoroughfare that would carry the duties of this building is where North Capital Street is cut through. That is in back of this building. Just taking the center portion and putting it out on a more important street where it was originally designed, it completely disturbs the set-up that General McDonald had for his plan.

MR. HUDNUT: It actually is on a more important street?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: That will be a through street.

MR. BELLUSCHI: This is more important in back?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: For the public view, the other faces just the Home.

MR. HUDNUT: I had not realized that.

MR. PORTER: That is the plan of North Capital Street being extended.

MR. MERRICK: That is correct.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: The first site plan we brought down here had the proposed route of North Capital Street coming through.

MR. HUDNUT: This is the North Capital view then, is it?

MR. PORTER: That is correct.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I do not mind a definite break, coming out with a definite strong motif rather than what was on the other side. Is it necessary to have this canted here; is it one of the structural requirements?

MR. PORTER: Mr. Belluschi, our structure engineer feels that that is--

MR. BELLUSCHI: A structural requirement?

MR. PORTER: --is a structural requirement. Canting of the corners, cutting the corners off.

MR. PORTER, JR.: No, that is so in some sense, yes, your load.

MR. BELLUSCHI: The idea was to break.

MR. PORTER, JR.: 90 degree angles logically will have higher stress calculations on the corner than a flatter angle. Any place you put pressures you get close concentration on an obstuse angle rather than acute angle. That is the only element.

MR. HUDNUT: Now let's see the North Capital Street elevations from the other scheme, Scheme "B".

This is the one. In other words you have this mass on both elevations, haven't you?

MR. BELLUSCHI: This is just--

MR. PORTER: Flaring that will go out there with extensions of this coming out--

MR. BELLUSCHI: This is one story or two story?

MR. MERRICK: Goes all the way up that way on every floor.

MR. HUDNUT: Carry this main corridor right through the service element here. I wonder why you did not carry it through here (indicating), too?

MR. BELLUSCHI: He could have opened up one here and one here. That was the idea of protecting--

MR. HUDNUT: Instead of going through the center it goes on along the edge. Do you think that is a serious matter?

MR. PORTER: Yes, I did. It means that you have to take everything through, if you had atomic, through one door.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You could put two doors here. A more imaginative planning--I understand, it is unfair now to do it--but you could have planned this corridor here differently. There are many ways that can be done.

MR. PORTER: The requirements at the Soldiers' Home--

MR. BELLUSCHI: You have extended this. You really have 12 more rooms than you had before.

MR. PORTER: That is correct.

MR. BELLUSCHI: It is not quite fair to say that you have more cubage or more area or more expanse since you increased also the number of rooms.

MR. MERRICK: We cut a floor off, too, to bring the balance back.

MR. BELLUSCHI: I see.

MR. PORTER: The requirements out there at the Home are a little bit different than the normal hospital. We are dealing with men who are anywhere from 65 up to say, 100. But some of them look as though they are even beyond that.

MR. BELLUSCHI: You will see that our main objective is to have an integrated plan. Here you have one motif, there another one--this does not quite tie with that. It looks very much without unity. Disunity was emphasized by several factors; by the original monumental treatment, of the center portion--and by the use of different materials; so that we felt unhappy about it, and suggested ways of getting some unity.

MR. PORTER: This whole thing gets a little bit out of proportion with the rest of the building, but I have to have in there, 42 beds, space to bring in from here and here, 42 beds to place there in case of an emergency.

MR. BELLUSCHI: First of all, I do not think the other members of the Commission liked this canter here because in reality instead of lightening the apparent heaviness, of the center portion it does just the opposite, it makes it heavier in appearance. Also it seems to me if this could be straightened out and treated very simply as a mass in relation to the balance it would still be bad from the point of view of proportion, but would not be quite as offensive if built of the same materials. The solarium does not have to have this shape; if this were straightened out and the solarium extended here it would improve the looks tremendously.

MR. PORTER: You would prefer to see this cut out?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I am just thinking about it. If we have to accept this plan, I still think that as Dr. Hudnut says if this had been studied a little more carefully at the beginning and I know it is rather late in the game, you could have arrived at a more satisfactory solution. I have no doubt about it. Now perhaps it is too late, but if we have to accept this scheme, we can perhaps try to unify so that you would not have a lot of motives just tied together, without feeling of esthetic unity.

MR. PORTER: I would be only too happy to restudy and carry along with those thoughts.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Don't you think the solarium as far as getting the sun, is too deep?

MR. PORTER: I really believe if that were off that way and cut that way--

MR. BELLUSCHI: I do not know. I know you are up to the deadline as far as appropriation goes.

MR. HUDNUT: Don't you think that if we had the same material all the way through--

MR. BELLUSCHI: That is a must, I think.

MR. HUDNUT: Then get these square. That would be a pretty big advance in the state of the thing as a whole.

MR. BELLUSCHI: If this is the main elevation, you have a wonderful opportunity to make this solarium really count.

MR. MERRICK: That is temporary.

MR. BELLUSCHI: We realize that.

MR. HUDNUT: Could that be done, Mr. Porter?

MR. PORTER: I would be very, very happy to restudy it.

MR. HUDNUT: I move, Mr. Chairman, that with those changes we approve the design.

MR. NEILD: I will second it, of course. May we decide right now what material is going to be used? I do not want to harp on the thing too much but it is a question that has been up some time. Will it be concrete or stone?

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Does someone want to make a suggestion?

MR. HUDNUT: You have two kinds of designs, one is technical and the other is esthetic. How can you weigh them? It just depends on how much the technical considerations, how important they are. Are they so important that you could not consider the use of limestone?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I received letters from Washington architects condemning the cast stone; I do not know what prompted them, that is why I am very careful in not saying anything against it other than it has given bad results in my own experience.

MR. HUDNUT: Esthetics--

MR. BELLUSCHI: Cast stone.

MR. HUDNUT: Shouldn't we argue it first technically?

MR. BELLUSCHI: Yes.

MR. HUDNUT: Is limestone admissible from a technical point of view? If the answer is yes, then I am in favor of limestone.

MR. BELLUSCHI: My answer--perhaps I should have said, the whole objection that was advanced in one of the first meetings was that you had to make your wall a little deeper; the thickness of the wall by the use of dovetail anchors would be increased by three quarters of an inch.

MR. PORTER: It varies.

MR. BELLUSCHI: So technically it means only a slight added cost, I would say that three-quarter inch of added thickness of wall is not very much. You can save that in the way you set up the elevator and pour the concrete. Then it will be grouted, I suppose, so that technically you can have the same good adhesion you have with cast stone. Of course you would not have the reinforcing bars going right through the veneer material.

I think if you anchor the limestone and grout back of it, you would have technically as good a veneer material.

MR. PORTER: What is it, 15 per cent required?

MR. PORTER, JR.: This is what we would have to do as I would interpret it. I would use nothing less than four-inch stone because of frost and so on. You would have your normal anchors, top anchors, then you would have the leading anchors and the bearing angles to take out the load a whole lot quicker than the 40 feet which the code allows us to do, but I think it could be done that way.

MR. NEILD: You strengthen it structurally and esthetically.

MR. PORTER, JR.: Of course that is purely based on how to take care of each material. If we feel that esthetically, the limestone is better, then you have to sacrifice in economy. That is the only thing that I would say as to that.

MR. MERRICK: How would you secure the bond?

MR. PORTER, JR.: We would have a different type wall. To get this terminology now, I think it is what the codes refer to as veneered wall. Veneered wall has no bonding to it. Therefore, veneered wall I think is limited under the District Code to 40 feet in height and then you have to relieve every 40 feet. Economically, I think on this job, probably every floor level would have to have relieving angles.

MR. HUDNUT: I take it then, Mr. Chairman, that the limestone is feasible technically, and therefore I move that that be included in our recommendations.

MR. NEILD: Second that.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: You all heard the motion, any further comments? All in favor, please say "aye".

(The motion was put to a vote and unanimously carried.)

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Unanimous. The motion is carried.

MR. HUDNUT: I would like to thank the architects for their cooperation. We have been pretty tough.

MR. PORTER: I am afraid I cannot go along with you on it.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Would you care to make a summarizing statement as to the changes in the plan section here that you would care to see made?

MR. HUDNUT: Perhaps you had better do that, Mr. Belluschi.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: We have had several ideas expressed.

MR. BELLUSCHI: When you say the plans, you meant the prints here, not the plans proper.

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: The plan here as to what treatment you wish and this part and also this general theme.

MR. BELLUSCHI: Before I make the summarization, my personal feeling is that the elevation could be simplified. If it is limestone which is a good material with variations and beauty of its own you could save a little money by eliminating some carvings and set-backs and recesses and junctions as shown here. I do not think it needs them because the building is not very long. So you can have a simple mass and concentrate your interest in the entrances. They do not have to be ornate. You can have rich material, such as granite if you wish.

The main points which may be brought out in the summarization are as follows: eliminate the canter on all four corners of the central portion of the building and have the solarium not quite so deep which would improve its usefulness, and have it extended to the full width of the center part, if possible. And also although I realize it is temporary, it could be studied architecturally so it will add to the total attractiveness of the structure.

MR. PORTER: You would not mind, Mr. Belluschi, seeing some slight breaks in that front?

MR. BELLUSCHI: I do not think the slight breaks are going to do very much for you. You already have a fairly strong break which will be the one that tells the story of having a special problem in the center part. Those minor breaks do not do anything but confuse the issue. That is something you have to study yourself. So far as I am speaking for myself, not for a summarization, it seems to me that all those little cuts and raises and so on, I think they cheapen it a little bit. They belong to a past period of architecture, and lack the straightforwardness we like to see in a building of this type which is a useful and very purposeful building.

CHAIRMAN FINELY: Does that give you what you want?

COLONEL McCUTCHEN: Thank you.

Thank you, gentlemen, very much.

MR. PORTER: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN FINLEY: Glad that everyone is in such a happy state of mind. I think we have two courses of action to be followed off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 31, 1952

Dear Colonel McCutchen:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their Meeting on January 10, 1952, considered very carefully your letter of December 20, and the revised designs (Scheme A and Scheme B) for the proposed hospital ward wing of the United States Soldiers' Home.

The Commission felt that Scheme A, which embodied a suggestion of the Commission made at a meeting held on November 29, 1951, to push the center portion of the building back, presented good possibilities for a better solution; however, it was noted from your letter that it would severely delay the completion of the building.

Therefore the Commission reverted to Scheme B, which was considered at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on October 25, 1951, and approved it, subject to the following further suggestions:

1. Eliminate the canter on all four corners of the central portion of the building, simplify its design and eliminate the many minor breaks, have the solarium not quite so deep, which would improve its usefulness, and have it extended to the full width of the center part, if possible.

2. The Commission strongly recommend the use of limestone for facing the building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Sgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

Col. Alan J. McCutchen,
District Engineer,
Corps of Engineers,
First & Douglas Sts. N.W.,

EXHIBIT H-2

The Commission of Fine Arts

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 21, 1942

Dear Colonel McCutchen:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on January 19, 1942, considered very carefully your letter of December 30, and the revised designs (Scheme A and Scheme B) for the proposed Supreme Court wing of the United States Soldiers' Home.

The Commission felt that Scheme A, which embodied a suggestion of the Commission made at a meeting held on November 24, 1941, to push the center portion of the building back, presented good possibilities for a better solution; however, it was noted from your letter that it would severely delay the completion of the building.

Therefore the Commission reverted to Scheme B, which was considered at a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on October 20, 1941, and approved it, subject to the following further suggestions:

1. Eliminate the center on all four corners of the central portion of the building, simplify its design and eliminate the many minor breaks, leave the solarium not quite so deep, which would improve its usefulness, and have it extended to the full width of the center part, if possible.

2. The Commission strongly recommend the use of limestone for facing the building.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Col. Alan G. McCutchen,
District Engineer,
Corps of Engineers,
Munsey Building,

Edgd.
David E. Finley,
Chairman.

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

1 Gold plaque from Ziwiyé, Sakkez, Durdestan.

1 Painting of bamboos by Wang Fu. Chinese, early Ming dynasty, dated in correspondence with June 15, 1410.

1 Indian miniature - audience group in tents.

1 Indian miniature - groups in boats.

1 Indian miniature - audience scene.

1 Indian miniature - preparation for a hunt.

1 Page from a Shahnamah. Persian, Inju school, Shiraz.

1 Bronze dromedary. Bactrian.

1 Luster bowl. Persian.

1 Crystal perfume pot. Egyptian, Fatimid period.

1 Crystal bottle. Egyptian, Fatimid period,

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

January 10, 1952. David E. Finley

For the Commission of Fine Arts

December 10, 1951 Katharine N. Rhoades

Katharine N. Rhoades

EXHIBIT I

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, or Mrs. Eugene Meyer, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the WILL of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

1 Gold plaque from Ziwiye, Sakkez, Kurdestan.

1 Painting of bamboos by Wang Fu. Chinese, early Ming dynasty, dated in correspondence with June 15, 1410.

1 Indian miniature - audience group in tents.

1 Indian miniature - groups in boats.

1 Indian miniature - audience scene.

1 Indian miniature - preparation for a hunt.

1 Page from a Shahnamah. Persian, Inju school, Shiraz.

1 Bronze dromedary. Bactrian.

1 Master bowl. Persian.

1 Crystal perfume pot. Egyptian, Fatimid period.

1 Crystal bottle. Egyptian, Fatimid period,

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution

David E. Finley
For the Commission of Fine Arts

January 10, 1952.

Katharine N. Rhoades
Katharine N. Rhoades

December 10, 1951

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY
on
GOVERNMENT AND ART
before the
National Commission of Fine Arts

General Services Administration.

Mr. Jess Larson, Administrator.

Mr. Larson opened with a brief outline of the duties and responsibilities of his Administration as set forth in Public Law 152 of the 81st Congress. He explained that the GSA is the administrative agency of the Executive branch of the Government for the acquisition, management, and disposal of all real and personal property. This includes the responsibility for the design and erection of all public and administrative buildings of the Federal Government and for the specifications, procurement, transportation, warehousing, distribution, utilization and exchange between agencies of all personal property. That portion of the duties of the GSA which chiefly concerns the study in hand is vested in a major subdivision, known as the Public Buildings Service, which is headed by Mr. W. E. Reynolds as Commissioner. There are, Mr. Larson explained, other functions of the GSA, such as the procurement of supplies for the civilian agencies under the Federal Supply Service, the keeping of Government documents and records under the National Archives and Records Management, the reactivation of Government owned industrial facilities, and the acquisition of strategic and critical materials throughout the world.

Mr. Larson then explained the procedures required in order to obtain the necessary funds from the Congress to carry out the duties and programs of the GSA. At the appropriation stage there calls for detailed estimates for specific projects, and the GSA is held directly responsible

EXHIBIT J

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY
on
GOVERNMENT AND ART
before the
National Commission of Fine Arts

General Services Administration.

Mr. Jess Larson, Administrator.

Mr. Larson opened with a brief outline of the duties and responsibilities of his administration as set forth in Public Law 152 of the 81st Congress. He emphasized that the GSA is the administrative agency of the Executive branch of the Government for the acquisition, management, and disposal of all real and personal property. This includes the responsibility for the design and erection of all public and administrative buildings in the Federal Government and for the specifications, procurement, transportation, warehousing, distribution, utilization and exchange between agencies of all personal property. This portion of the duties of the GSA which chiefly concerns the Commission may be viewed in a major subdivision, known as the Public Buildings Service, headed by Mr. L. S. Lawrence as Commissioner. There are, Mr. Larson explained, other functions of the GSA, such as the procurement of supplies for the civilian agencies, the operation of many services, the keeping of Government documents and records, the Federal Law Revision Commission, the Interdepartmental Committee on Government Owned Industrial Activities, and the acquisition of strategic and critical materials through the stockpile.

Mr. Larson then explained the procedures required in order to develop the necessary funds from the Congress to carry out the construction programs of the GSA. In the appropriation cycle there exists a [illegible] for specific projects, and the GSA is responsible, [illegible]

to the Congress for the manner in which funds are spent. In order best to meet the desires of the Congress and to achieve the highest standards of design and decoration in the erection of new buildings, it was his belief that there should be a working relationship with the Commission of Fine Arts, based on a cooperative understanding of the practical aspects of the problem.

Gilbert S. Underwood, Director, Design and Construction Division, Public Building Service, GSA.

Mr. Underwood exposed the policy of the present administration of the Public Building Service with respect to art in buildings by stating that it was motivated by a determined obligation to create the finest which can be had in architecture and functional decoration. He explained his interpretation of the phrase "functional decoration" as meaning a mural which immortalizes a portion of the history of the community in which the building stands, or sculpture which delights the eye and does not deface the general architectural scheme. In general the policy was to build edifices which were functional, economical and beautiful.

Referring to the days when WPA subsidized artists to decorate public buildings, he said that much of what had been done had been severely criticized by local citizens. The method of selecting artists had been by competition, with the winners getting the major projects and the lesser projects going to the runners-up. Under this process the resulting works of art were bad or mediocre, and only a small portion were good. It was his belief that the only method of obtaining first-rate artists and sculptors was to select from those whose past performances indicated proven ability. In arriving at such a choice, the Commission of Fine Arts could be very helpful. He urged that a procedure be established similar to that employed in the case of the General Accounting Office building, in which the Commission were consulted and furnished the names of eight or more sculptors, from among which the names of those finally commissioned were chosen. In any such procedure, however, he pointed out, consideration

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

should be given to the natural pride of localities and communities, and that, where possible, local artists and sculptors should be used. To this end, the Commission should be prepared to include on their lists artists and sculptors from a wide geographic area.

In connection with the selection of architects, Mr. Underwood expressed the view that there are so many factors involved that he did not believe the Commission could be of any help. It was the custom of the Public Building Service to pick the architect best suited to the job by talent, by performance, by experience, and by the quality of his organization. Furthermore, they have a policy of choosing architects from the actual town or city where the building is to be built. If the man selected is found not completely capable of handling the job, he is given the support of a stronger, better-established firm. Thus the local architect gets the credit for the building, but is aided by experienced colleagues.

At the suggestion of the members of the Commission that the muralists, sculptors and landscape architects should be selected simultaneously with the architects, so that they can all work together for the creation of an harmonious whole, Mr. Underwood agreed that it would be both practical and possible.

He said that there had been a rule, deriving, he believed, more from custom than law, under which one and one-half percent of the total appropriations for a given building was set aside for decoration - sculpture and murals. He did not approve of this formula because it was too rigid. There were buildings, he explained, which, because of their small size or function, could not properly accomodate this sort of artistic decoration. On the other hand there were many large buildings which called for murals and sculpture.

At this point Mr. Larson intervened to say that he believed this formula will prove more harmful than helpful in that it will establish a ceiling for expenditures for decoration, rather than a floor. He suggested that it

should be given to the general type of facilities and amenities, and that, where possible, local artists and craftsmen should be given work. To this end, the Commission should be prepared to include on their lists architects and sculptors from a wide geographic area.

In connection with the selection of architects, Mr. Lamprecht expressed the view that there are so many buildings involved that we do not believe the Commission could do so on its own. In our view the public building service to which the commission work should be the judge, by preference, by experience, and by the quality of its organization. Moreover, they have a public or observing architect from the local town or city where the building is to be built. If he is not selected in some such manner, experts of branching who, as we have been informed, are otherwise established there. These observers architects give the commission the knowledge, but is aided by experienced colleagues.

As the suggestion of the members of the commission, then the architects, sculptors and landscape architects should be selected simultaneously with the architects, so that they can all work together on the creation of a harmonious whole. Mr. Lamprecht agreed that it would be [illegible] the [illegible].

He said that there had been [illegible] nowadays, in Canada, are the [illegible] certain that, under modern [illegible] the total [illegible] [illegible] for [illegible] - [illegible] [illegible]. He did not [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] which, because of [illegible] [illegible] or [illegible], could not properly accommodate this sort of artistic [illegible]. In the [illegible] there were many large buildings [illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

At this point Mr. [illegible] observed he was [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] will prove more [illegible] than [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] for decoration, rather than a [illegible]. He suggested that it

might be helpful if the Commission would ennunciate general policies in the matter which could be widely disseminated. He also suggested that definite procedures be worked out between GSA and the Commission which could be followed by the present incumbents and which could serve as a guide to successors. These, he felt, should apply for all buildings of the Federal Government throughout the United States, and not be confined to those within the District of Columbia as in the past. He asked that Mr. Finley and Mr. Underwood undertake to draft these procedures.

Subsequent to these hearings, the following letter from Mr. Larson was received by the Chairman of the Commission:

(Quote in full letter appearing on pages 108 & 109, Volume 1.)

Smithsonian Institution.

Mr. John E. Graf, Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Graf briefly outlined the administrative and fiscal organization of the Institution with respect to its interests in fine arts. There are two bureaux, he stated, which have to do with art: first, the National Collection of Fine Arts; and second, the Freer Gallery. The former is entirely supported by federal funds. A small staff of eight people are engaged in the acquisition, care, preservation and exhibition of the collections, and in the maintenance of records. In addition, a great deal of their time is taken up in answering written and oral inquiries on art in general. This staff of eight does not include the regular mechanical and building maintenance employees.

The Freer Gallery, a gift to the Federal Government of the late Mr. Charles Freer, is concerned primarily with Near Eastern and Far Eastern art. In accordance with the rather strict stipulations of the deed of gift, the Freer Gallery cannot accept gifts or loans of objects of art, nor can it send out or loan to any other museum or institution any part of its collection for exhibition or study. The trust fund established by Mr. Freer pays the salaries of

the professional, custodial and top clerical staff, as well as for the upkeep of the grounds, for structural changes to the existing building, and for the acquisition of objects for the collections. Federal funds take care of the maintenance staff, some of the minor clerical and custodial positions and the upkeep of the building.

Mr. John A. Pope, Assistant Director, Freer Gallery of Art.

Mr. Pope explained that the basic function of the Freer Gallery, as set forth in the articles of the foundation, is that of a study centre of the civilization of the Orient as it is manifest in its artistic creation and development. To this end the Freer fund provides for an expert professional staff which engages in the examination of examples of Near and Far Eastern art, in research in these fields, in the publication of monographs and reports on the results of their research, and in the answering of questions posed by interested students and scholars throughout the world. It is also provided in the fund that, in order to promote the ideals of beauty, objects of the highest quality, in harmony with the general aims of the Gallery, may be purchased from time to time.

Mr. Pope went on to say that the group of Chinese bronzes in the collection is not equalled anywhere in the world; that the Chinese paintings are on a par with those of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston; and that the collection of Persian miniatures is considered the finest in existence. These three groups are recognized by scholars throughout the world. What the public sees of these at any one time is, however, only about eight percent of the total. The public exhibitions are very carefully selected and are changed periodically. Those objects not on public view are not put away in storage, as is the case with most museums, but are available in a series of study rooms for students and scholars where they are readily at hand.

At the time of Mr. Freer's death in 1919 the collection contained about 10,000 objects. During the 25-odd years since the Gallery was opened,

the professional, curatorial and technical staff, as well as for the upkeep of the grounds, the structural changes to the existing building, and for the acquisition of objects for the collections. Several items were cut out of the maintenance staff, some of the other clerical and custodial positions and the upkeep of the building.

Mr. John A. Pope, Assistant Director, Freer Gallery of Art.

Mr. Pope explained that the main function of the Freer Gallery, as set forth in the articles of its foundation, is that of a study center of the civilization of the Orient as it is mirrored in its artistic creation and development. To this end the Freer Fund provides for an expert professional staff which engages in the examination of examples of Near and Far Eastern art, in research in these fields, in the publication of monographs and reports on the results of their research, and in the answering of questions posed by interested students and scholars throughout the world. It is also provided in the fund that, in order to promote the ideals of beauty, objects of the highest quality, in harmony with the general aim of the Gallery, may be purchased from time to time.

Mr. Pope went on to say that the group of Chinese bronzes in the collection is not usually considered among scholarly that the Chinese paintings are on a par with those of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston; and that the collection of Persian miniatures is considered the finest in existence. These three groups are recognized by scholars throughout the world. Most the public pass of these at any one time is, however, only about eight percent of the total. The public exhibitions are very carefully arranged and are changed periodically. These objects not on public view are not put away in storage, as is the case with most museums, but are available in a number of study rooms for students and scholars who are usually are readily at hand.

At the time of Mr. Freer's death in 1919 the collection contained 11,000 objects. During the 23-odd years since the Gallery was opened,

only six or seven hundred pieces have been added, indicating the care which has been bestowed in acquiring items only of the highest quality.

As to the small island of American paintings in the midst of this Oriental collection, Mr. Pope explained that this part of the collection, which were the works of his artist friends, was permanently closed at the time of his death under the terms of Mr. Freer's will.

Mr. Pope said that the Gallery's needs were for additional space and for capable clerical personnel on Civil Service. He explained that Freer funds may not be used for building additional museum space. There was apparently no legal objection to the Gallery receiving gifts of money, but it seemed doubtful that a private donor would be interested in giving money to add a wing to a Gallery named after another man.

Mr. Thomas M. Beggs, Director, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Mr. Beggs stated that prior to the founding of the Smithsonian Institution in 1846 the Government had accepted gifts of art. Once the Institution had been established, these gifts increased in quantity and scope as scientific and cultural organizations in Washington adopted the practice of turning over their collections to the Smithsonian.

The National Collection of Fine Arts has many and varied collections, some of greater historical and ethnological than artistic interest. It was originally created as a Bureau of the Institution for the purpose of housing the Harriet Lane Johnstone Collection and was called the National Gallery of Art. In 1906 a friendly law suit established the fact that the Smithsonian Institution was the official and legally designated agency of the Government for accepting and holding objects of art. It was subsequent to this decision that other important donations came along, such as the Ralph Cross Johnson and Gellatly collections. These earlier gifts are rather too severely restricted in that they have to be shown in their entirety and may not be added to, with

only six or seven hundred pieces have been added, including the one which has been bequeathed in acquiring items only of the highest quality.

As to the small island of American paintings in the midst of this oriental collection, Mr. Pope explained that this part of the collection, which were the works of his artist friends, was permanently closed at the time of his death under the terms of Mr. Freer's will.

Mr. Pope said that the Gallery's needs were for additional space and for capable clerical personnel on Civil Service. He explained that Freer funds may not be used for building additional museum space. There was apparently no legal objection to the Gallery receiving gifts of money, but it seemed doubtful that a private donor would be interested in giving money to add a wing to a Gallery named after another man.

Mr. Thomas M. Beggs, Director, National Collection of Fine Arts.

Mr. Beggs stated that prior to the founding of the Smithsonian Institution in 1846 the Government had accepted gifts of art. Once the Institution had been established, these gifts increased in quantity and scope as scientific and cultural organizations in Washington adopted the practice of turning over their collections to the Smithsonian.

The National Collection of Fine Arts has many and varied collections, some of greater historical and ethnological than artistic interest. It was originally created as a bureau of the Institution for the purpose of housing the Harriet Lane Johnstone Collection and was called the National Gallery of Art. In 1906 a friendly law suit established the fact that the Smithsonian Institution was the official and legally designated agency of the Government for accepting and holding objects of art. It was subsequent to this decision that other important donations came along, such as the Ralph Cross Johnson and Gellatly collections. These earlier gifts are rather too severely restricted in that they have to be shown in their entirety and may not be added to, with

the result that many objects of inferior quality are exhibited, and in some cases are even inaccurately labelled.

In addition to these three collections, Mr. Beggs said, there are others such as the William T. Evans Collection of American Art. There is also the Ranger Fund of the National Academy of Design, the proceeds of which are devoted to the purchase of the works of contemporary artists for assignment on loan to libraries, museums and colleges throughout the country. These loans are recalled by the Smithsonian Art Commission ten years after the death of the artist, at which time they may be accepted as part of the permanent collection of the National Collection of Fine Arts. There is also the Catherine Walden Meyer Fund for the acquisition of miniatures, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of the Smithsonian Art Commission. And recently there was the gift of 278 paintings by Alice Barney, a Washington portraitist. There are assurances that this donor will supplement this gift with a fund for the purchase of works of deserving living artists. Works thus acquired will probably become part of a loan collection, not acceptable for the permanent collection, which will be lent to colleges and libraries throughout the country, especially in the smaller communities which do not have the benefits of an important art centre. It was Mr. Beggs' feeling that such a living and growing loan collection may become the means of encouraging artists and may eventually form an accumulation from which will result important additions to the great national collections of the Government in Washington.

Mr. Beggs then spoke of the collection of the Chicago Society of Etchers which was received during the period from 1935 to 1941 and is characteristic of the American art of that time. Because of lack of space this has to be shown in book form, which is entirely unsatisfactory. The need is for a new building in which all these collections can be properly exhibited, not necessarily as outstanding masterpieces, but as the progressive development of American art, in a series of period rooms.

the result that many objects of inferior quality are exhibited, and in some cases are even inaccurately labelled.

In addition to these three collections, Mr. Begg said, there are others such as the William T. Evans Collection of American Art. There is also the Ranger Fund of the National Academy of Design, the proceeds of which are devoted to the purchase of the works of contemporary artists for assignment on loan to libraries, museums and colleges throughout this country. These loans are recalled by the Smithsonian Art Commission ten years after the death of the artist, at which time they may be accepted as part of the permanent collection of the National Collection of Fine Arts. There is also the Katherine Walden Dwyer Fund for the acquisition of masterpieces, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee of the Smithsonian Art Commission. And recently there was the gift of 276 paintings by Alice Barney, a Washington portraitist. There are assurances that this donor will supplement this with such a fund for the purchase of works of deserving living artists. Those that acquired will probably become part of a loan collection, not acceptable for the permanent collection, which will be lent to colleges and libraries throughout the country, especially in the smaller communities which do not have the benefits of an important art center. It was Mr. Begg's feeling that such a living and growing loan collection may become the means of encouraging artists and may eventually form an accumulation from which will result important additions to the great national collections of the Government in Washington.

Mr. Begg then spoke of the collection of the Chicago Society of Etchers which was received during the period from 1925 to 1941 and is characteristic of the American art of that time. Because of lack of space this has to be shown in book form, which is entirely unsatisfactory. The need is for a new building in which all these collections can be properly exhibited, not necessarily as outstanding masterpieces, but as the progressive development of American art, in a series of period rooms.

In connection with the circularization of educational exhibits, Mr. Beggs told about the show of the pictorial art of the American Indian which was brought together in collaboration with the Department of Anthropology of the Smithsonian. This attempted to demonstrate the adventure of the parallel development of the White Man and the Indian from the tepee and the log cabin to the Ford car and modern appurtenances. It showed the influence of the White Man on Indian art, and pointed out how tribal customs and ceremonies were being lost in the same way that many ethnic groups in Europe were losing their folk ways. Exhibits such as this, which could bring a vital message to sensitive racial minorities in these confused times, could be circulated throughout the United States under the Barney fund. Unfortunately, however, the terms of that fund preclude the sending of exhibits outside the country. If the State Department desired to send such exhibits abroad, they would have to provide the funds. Mr. Beggs pointed out that some of the material of the National Collection was restricted by deed of gift from being loaned on exhibition, but for all material not so restricted it would be entirely possible to develop and arrange for exhibitions to be sent abroad under the sponsorship of the State Department, provided the necessary funds were made available.

Mr. Graf then spoke about the short and long-term plans of the Institution. His immediate preoccupation was the preservation of the best of the different collections under the present troubled international conditions. He did not know when they would have to start, or how long a period they would be given in which to take protective measures. It was proven during World War II that the museum that is stripped of its treasures is of no help to the defense effort in maintaining public morale. He felt that before long a Bill providing for the preservation of Government collections, smiliar to the one enacted during the last war, should be introduced in the Congress. It had been a wise Bill, which had worked well, without the squandering of money - in fact money had actually been returned to the Treasury.

In connection with the circularization of educational exhibits,

Mr. Peggs told about the slow of the pictorial art of the American Indian which was brought together in collaboration with the Department of Anthropology of the Smithsonian. This showpiece to demonstrate the advantage of the parallel development of the White man and the Indian from the tepee and the log cabin to the Ford car and modern apartments. It showed the influence of the White man on Indian art, and pointed out how tribal customs and ceremonies were being lost in the same way that many ethnic groups in Europe were losing their folk ways. Exhibits over the city, which could bring a vital message to measure social adjustments in these changed times, could be circulated throughout the United States under the Bureau fund. Incidentally, however, the same in that fund precludes the sending of exhibits outside the country. If the State Department desired to send such exhibits abroad, they would have to provide the funds. Mr. Peggs pointed out that some of the material of the National Collection was recorded by deed or gift from being loaned on exhibition, but for all material not so restricted it would be entirely possible to develop arrangements for exhibitions to be sent abroad under the sponsorship of the State Department, provided the necessary funds were made available.

Mr. Graf then spoke about the short and long-range plans of the Institution. His immediate preoccupation was the preservation of hundreds of the Institution collections under the present budgetary conditions. He did not know what they would have to store, or how long a period there would be time in which to take preservation measures. It was proven during World War II that the reason that is achieved of the preserves is of no help to the science office in maintaining public morale. He felt that before long a full provisioning program preservation of Government collections, similar to one adopted during the last war, should be introduced in the Congress. It had been a wise policy and worked well, without the squandering of money - in fact money had actually been returned to the Treasury.

As to the long-term plans, it was Mr. Graf's opinion that his desires were those of all Government people: more people, more money, and more space. Of these space was the most critical problem of the Institution. All of its space is presently filled, and its attics hold many objects which should be on exhibition. Unless additional space is provided, the normal growth of collections must, of necessity, be decelerated.

The Library of Congress.

Dr. Luther H. Evans, Librarian.

Speaking first of the Music Division of the Library, Dr. Evans said that he wished to make a clear distinction between the music program on Government appropriated funds and the program on gift funds. Government funds are used for the acquisition of books on music, of printed and written scored, and of phonograph records. They are also used for the making of field recordings of certain kinds of folk music and for the cataloguing and issuance of catalog cards, extra copies of which are available for sale at cost plus ten percent.

The musical performance program is entirely supported by private donation to the Library. The two principal gifts to date have been the Doolidge and Whittall Foundations, and there are a few others which have made concerts possible. These concerts have been largely in the field of chamber music, although there have been occasional presentations of dance groups and vocalists. Dr. Evans stated the opinion that the musical performance program might well be enlarged, but to do this might require additional space. Thus far the Library had gone along from hand to mouth with concerts under the gift funds and any plan to extend these activities with Government assistance would have to be carefully weighed before a firm recommendation could be considered.

The only other activity of the Library which concerned fine arts, Dr. Evans stated, was the collection of fine prints. The Library did not go in for paintings and sculpture, except for the literature on these subjects. There is an arrangement with the National Gallery of Art under which the Library has

As to the Inner-Bar plans, it was Mr. Cheit's opinion that the problems were those of all government people: more people, more money, and more space. Of these space was the most critical problem of the Department. All of the space is presently filled, and the action that may otherwise which should be in addition. Unless additional space is provided, the normal growth of collection work, of necessity, is decelerated.

The library of Congress.

Mr. Lyman L. Myers, Librarian.

Speaking first on the music division of the Library, Mr. Myers said that he wished to make a clear distinction between the music program in performance appropriates funds and the program on film music. Government funds are used for the acquisition of books on music, in printed and written manuscript, and of phonograph records. They are also used for the binding of field recordings of certain kinds of folk music and for the cataloging and lessons on binding cards, some copies of which are available for sale at cost plus ten percent.

The music-performance program is entirely supported by private donation to the Library. The two principal gifts to date have been the Coolidge and Whitall foundations, and there are a few other funds have made generous gifts. There is never been any lapse in the field of chamber music, although there have been occasional presentations of opera groups and vocalists. Mr. Myers stated the end has been his concept that Congress might want to consider, but to do this would require additional space. Some of the Library and more than from Congress to fund such concerts under the gift funds and may plan to record these activities with government personnel and have been successfully employed before a full recommendation could be considered.

The only other problem of the Library which concerned Mr. Myers, Mr. Myers stated, was the collection of some prints. The Library is set up for portraits and scrapbooks, except for the importance on these subjects. There is no correspondence with the Internal Revenue or any other much the Library has

agreed to lend the Gallery any books which it might require, and to purchase them if they are not already in the Library. If both institutions need particular and expensive books which are not common as reference tools, then the Library will buy a second copy.

The problem of the duplication of the fine print collections is now under consideration and the Library is seriously contemplating turning over at least part of its collection to the National Gallery of Art for administration. In the case of the gift of the Rosenwald collection of 17,000 prints to the Government, Mr. Lessing Rosenwald decreed that the prints should repose in the National Gallery and that the books concerning prints should be held in the Library of Congress. This arrangement has served to stimulate the supplying of the Gallery's book needs by the Library.

Dr. Evans also spoke of the $100,000 given by Mrs. Whittall for a program of poetry reading which is just in the process of getting started. Exactly how it will develop is not yet clear, but the general idea is to make poetry come alive for an audience in one place, rather than through the more remote medium of radio broadcasting.

In addition, Dr. Evans said, there is a program for the circulating of fine prints exhibits. Thus far this has been limited to a gift fund donated for the purpose. It was his belief that circulating exhibits are an appropriate governmental activity, and that the Library could do far more in this field if it had more Government funds. There is an annual exhibit of contemporary print production, which, though not limited to Americans, is largely contributed by American artists. The Library is endeavoring to interest Mexican artists in the forthcoming show, and to this end has set up a committee in Mexico to stimulate interest among Mexican etchers and engravers.

Mr. Edward N. Waters, Assistant Chief, Music Dividion.

Mr. Waters started by explaining the activities under the principal donations to the Library in the field of music. The Coolidge Foundation, he

agreed to lend the Gallery any books which it might require, and to purchase them if they are not already in the Library. In both institutions need particular and expensive books which are not common as reference tools, then the Library will buy a second copy.

The problem of the duplication of the fine print collections is now under consideration and the Library is seriously contemplating turning over at least part of its collection to the National Gallery of Art for administration. In the case of the gift of the Rosenwald collection of 14,000 prints to the Government, Mr. Lessing Rosenwald desired that the prints should repose in the National Gallery and that the books concerning prints should be held in the Library of Congress. This arrangement has served to stimulate the supplying of the Gallery's book needs by the Library.

Dr. Evans also spoke of the $100,000 given by Mrs. Whitall for a program of poetry reading which is just in the process of getting started. Exactly how it will develop is not yet clear, but the general idea is to make poetry come alive for an audience in one place, rather than through the more remote medium of radio broadcasting.

In addition, Dr. Evans said, there is a program for the circulating of fine prints exhibits. Thus far this has been limited to a gift fund created for the purpose. It was his belief that circulating exhibits are an appropriate governmental activity, and that the Library could do far more in this field if it had more Government funds. There is an annual exhibit of contemporary print production, which, though not limited to Americans, is largely contributed by American artists. The Library is endeavoring to interest Mexican artists in the forthcoming show, and to this end has set up a committee in Mexico to stimulate interest among Mexican etchers and engravers.

Mr. Edward B. Stern, Assistant Chief, Music Division.

Mr. Stern started by explaining the activities under his principal connections to the Library in the field of music. The Coolidge Foundation, in

said, gives concerts both at the Library of Congress in Washington and in other cities and towns throughout the country. A system of extension concerts has been devised whereby the Library attempts to promote and activate performances of chamber music in colleges, libraries and museums of communities which are normally deprived of such opportunities. In special and rare cases assistance is given to a struggling chamber music society which is doing a real community service. Under the system in force agreement is reached with the recipient of the gift concerning the particular artist or ensemble which will perform. The cost is then shared equally between the Library and the recipient. This cost for a quartet or trio generally varies from $500 to $800. The Library does not care how the recipient community raises its share of the money - whether they do it by sale of tickets or through subsidy is immaterial. Its sole interest is to provide sufficient financial assistance to enable the community to launch a series of concerts which will eventually become self-sustaining. Each prospective recipient is told that the Library is not interested in aiding them at the start unless they can foresee a self-sustaining basis within two or three years. This attitude creates an incentive to build for a permanent local organization.

The Whittall Foundation, Mr. Waters explained, gives its concerts only in the Library of Congress, inasmuch as they stem from Mrs. Whittall's gift of five instruments by Antonio Stradivari which require constant, or, at least frequent, playing in order to be kept in perfect condition. The Budapest String Quartet have been rendering this service.

Another considerable gift is the Kousevitzky Foundation, which, though not presently devoted to concert-giving, may do so under the terms of its charter. Primarily this foundation is aimed for the promotion and creation of new music, and is therefore momentarily limited to the commissioning of new compositions. As these are not limited to chamber music and are presently directed more toward operas and symphonies, the Library lacks both the means and the space for their performance.

said, gives concerts based on the library of records in Washington and in other cities and towns throughout the country. A system of extension concerts has been devised whereby the library attempts to provide and subsidize performances of chamber music in colleges, libraries and museums of communities which are normally deprived of such opportunities. In musical and fine arts clubs assistance is given to a struggling chamber music society which is doing a real community service. Under the system in force agreement is reached with the residents of the city concerning the particular artists or ensembles which will perform. The cost is then shared equally between the library and the residents. The cost for a quartet or trio generally varies from $50 to $60. The library does not pay for the residents community raises the cause of the money - whether they do it by sale of tickets or through subsidy is immaterial. The sole interest is to provide sufficient financial assistance to enable the community to engage a series of concerts which will eventually become self-supporting. Each prospective resident is told that the library is not interested in aiding them at the start unless they can foresee a self-supporting basis within two or three years. This attitude creates an incentive to build for a permanent local organization.

The national association, Mr. Moore explained, gives its concerts only in the library of Congress, because of the expense. Without a gift of five thousand or ten thousand dollars which includes counsel, or, at least frequent, playing in order to be kept in perfect condition. The instruments which perform have been rendering this service.

Another outstanding gift is the musicians' foundation, which, though not primarily devoted to concert-giving, can do so under the terms of its charter. Primarily this foundation is given for the promotion and protection of new music, and is therefore necessarily limited in the commissioning of new compositions. As these are not limited to chamber music and are assessible interest more towards opera and symphonies, the library feels that the money and the chance for chamber performance.

The acquisition of original manuscript scores has arisen, Mr. Waters said, from all three of these Foundations. In addition, Mrs. Whittall has made a separate gift of one of the most important and comprehensive collections of the manuscripts of the master-composer, Johannes Brahms. Every year the Library's collection of manuscript scores grows through new acquisitions, and it now includes examples of the compositions of Mozart, Beethoven and Bach.

There is also the priceless collection of some 1600 flutes bequeathed to the Library by the late Dayton C. Miller, Professor of Physics at the Case School of Applied Science in Cleveland. These include specimens of flute-type instruments from the most primitive pipes of ancient Greece and the Orient to the modern flute. As a musicological collection it is complete, having, as well as the instruments, copies of every published document on the subject.

Dr. Evans then resumed in order to reply to two questions posed by the Chairman; one concerning the desirability of the Government providing a building in the capital in which operas, concerts and ballets could be performed, and the other concerning the ability and desire of the Library to assume the responsibility of sending American musical organizations on tours abroad in order to spread American culture, provided the funds were made available.

To the first question Dr. Evans replied that for many years he had felt that there should be a far more active program of the Government in the cultural and artistic fields. He was in favor of some sort of Government organization being formed in order to perform this function. However, the problem of placing this responsibility with the Library of Congress should be carefully weighed. An aspect in its favor is that the Library is rather non-political. On the other hand it is outside of the control of the President, which, in some ways, might be a handicap. The question to be faced is whet er this type of activity ought to be put in an agency where the President and the Secretary of State can have some say about the policies to be followed and the initiatives to be taken, or whether it ought to escape that as part of the escape from politics, in the same manner that the

National Gallery of Art escapes politics by having its board of trustees.

As to the second question, Dr. Evans expressed doubt that the Library of Congress was the best agency to sponsor symphony orchestras on foreign tours, inasmuch as it reports only to the Congress, to which it is responsible for its appropriations and its policies. He felt that some new agency whose sole purpose was the promotion of music might better serve as sponsor for such projects. He added that, although not seeking the job or desiring to enlarge the scope of activities of the Library, nevertheless he had confidence that the Music Division was competent to handle anything within its field of operations, and that, if called upon to do so in the national interest, would be good soldiers and organize concert and ballet tours of American companies in foreign lands, with the understanding, of course, that the necessary funds were provided.

Mr. Waters intervened to remind the Commission that in 1891 or 1892 the Congress had passed a law establishing a conservatory of music to be lodged in Washington. This law had been inspired by a woman named Jeanette Thurber who had founded the National Conservatory of Music in New York, and, as far as Mr. Waters knew, it had never been repealed. According to the ideas of Miss Thurber, talented students were to be appointed to the school by members of Congress such on the same basis as they appoint students to Annapolis and West Point. The school was to have an auditorium large enough for symphony concerts and the production of operas.

Dr. Evans closed the testimony for the Library of Congress by saying that regarding the establishment of a music centre in Washington, he was very open-minded as to whether it should be handled by the Library or an agency to be created, and that he would be glad to participate in any discussions on the subject. He felt that music was a legitimate concern of the Government and that if private sources were exhausted, the Library would probably face up to it and ask Congress directly for more money.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 25, 1952

Dear Mr. Coy:

About a year ago the President requested The Commission of Fine Arts to conduct an inquiry and report as to the best way "to integrate and reorganize present Governmental art activities both in the regular set-up and the defense set-up." Heads of departments and agencies of the Government are being consulted to assist in this matter.

It was suggested at a recent meeting of The Commission of Fine Arts that a statement from The Federal Communications Commission on the subject should be included in the report to the President. Therefore, we would appreciate it if you or your representative could meet with the Commission of Fine Arts to discuss the subject at the next meeting to be held in Washington on Tuesday, February 26, 1952. We would suggest 11:00 a.m. if that is convenient for you. The Commission meet in room 7000 of the Interior Department Building at 18th and C Streets, Northwest.

Sincerely yours

Sgd.
David E. Finley

Chairman

Honorable Wayne Coy, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
New Post Office Building
12th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT K

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Interior Dept. - Wash. D. C.

January 25, 1952

Dear Mr. Coy:

About a year ago the President requested The Commission of Fine Arts to conduct an inquiry and report as to the best way "to integrate and reorganize present Governmental art activities both in the regular set-up and the defense set-up." Heads of departments and agencies of the Government are being consulted to assist in this matter.

It was suggested at a recent meeting of The Commission of Fine Arts that a statement from The Federal Communications Commission on the subject should be included in the report to the President. Therefore, we would appreciate it if you or your representative could meet with the Commission of Fine Arts to discuss the subject at the next meeting to be held in Washington on Tuesday, February 26, 1952. We would suggest 11:00 a.m. if that is convenient for you. The Commission meet in room 7000 of the Interior Department Building at 18th and C streets, Northwest.

Sincerely yours

Sgd.
David E. Finley

Chairman

Honorable Eugene Coy, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
New Post Office Building
14th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington D. C.

EXHIBIT A